

The University of Chicago

STUDIES IN ATTO KOINOY IN OVID

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1938

By
HENRY MATRAU ELLER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1938

The University of Chicago

STUDIES IN ATTO KOINOY IN OVID

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1938

By
HENRY MATRAU ELLER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1938



PREFACE

I wish to express my indebtedness to Professor Henry Washington Prescott, under whose direction this dissertation was prepared, for his generous assistance and many helpful suggestions; to Professor Berthold Louis Ullman, for his careful reading of the dissertation; and to the staff of the Classics Library of the University of Chicago, for their co-operation.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548403_0038

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE COMMON ELEMENT EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST MEMBER . .	20
EXCURSUS TO CHAPTER I	47
II. THE COMMON ELEMENT EXPRESSED IN THE SECOND MEMBER . .	52
III. THE COMMON ELEMENTS DISTRIBUTED	84

INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive historical study of AK¹ has yet to be written. Such a study would trace the development of the AK scheme from its origin, so far as could be determined, in folk speech, to its most highly developed and rhetorical use in the Greek and Roman poets, and would aim to show the differences between various authors, especially poets, in their use of the figure. Studies in the use of the figure by single authors (or by a particular group of authors) might be said to constitute single chapters contributory to the ultimate study. The present dissertation is intended to be such a chapter. Unfortunately, as will be seen, there has been some disagreement among scholars regarding the definition and scope of AK; hence the present treatise will not always be in agreement with other studies in the application of the term AK.

The definitions of the ancient rhetors and grammarians, and the comments of scholiasts show that there was in antiquity considerable diversity of opinion regarding the limitations of the figures zeugma, ellipsis, and AK.² The term zeugma was applied to various structures in which an element common to several members appears in one member,³ or in which the word which is expressed suggests one of different meaning in the member in which it is not expressed.⁴ Some authorities applied the term ellipsis

¹This abbreviation has been adopted for purposes of brevity in the present dissertation.

²This diversity was noted, with citation of ancient authorities, by Georg Clemm, De breviloquentiae Taciteae quibusdam generibus (Leipzig: Teubner, 1881), pp. 5-41, and by J. W. T. Van Konijnenburg, De figurae AK usu apud Vergilium (diss., Groningen, 1896), pp. 1-II.

³Pseudo-Zonaias in Leonhard von Spengel, Rhetores Graeci (Leipzig: Teubner, 1853-56), III, 168; two anonymous Rhetors (Spengel, III, 185, 172); Pseudo-Asconius on Cicero In Verrem i. 54; Bede in Karl Halm, Rhetores Latin minores (Leipzig: Teubner, 1863), p. 608; Rufinianus (Halm, p. 408); Carmen de figuris 186 f. (Halm, p. 69).

⁴Servius ad Aen. xii. 436.

indifferently to instances in which a common element appears in the context and to those in which an element missing from the context must be supplied;¹ some apparently restricted the term to instances of absolute omission,² others, namely the rhetors who defined both AK and ellipsis, clearly did so.³ These rhetors, and the other rhetors who use the term AK,⁴ apply that term to structure in which the common element is expressed in the first member (usually without regard to its position in the member⁵) or in preceding context to that in which it is, grammatically speaking, understood. The Greek scholia apply the term AK (or closely related terms) both to this structure and to that in which the common element occurs in the second member (regardless of its position in the member) or in subsequent context.⁶ Eustathius, in a scholion on Iliad xiv. 192, calls the latter type of structure "the newer scheme of AK."⁷ The scholion on Iliad x. 167

¹Pseudo-Zonaias (Spengel, III, 167); Aquila Romanus (Halm, p. 37); Carmen de figuris 175-77 (Halm, p. 70); Gregory of Corinth (Spengel, III, 221).

²Alexander (Spengel, III, 33, emended text in Christian Walz, Rhetores Graeci [Stuttgart: Cotta, 1832-36], VIII, 470); Quintilian i. 5. 40; viii. 6. 21; Scholiast on Juvenal i. 88 f. in Paul Wessner, Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora (Leipzig: Teubner, 1931), p. 9; Martianus Capella (Halm, p. 483); Isidore (Halm, p. 517).

³Phoebammon (Spengel, III, 46); Tiberius (Spengel, III, 76, 78); Georgius Choeroboscus (Spengel, III, 252, 256); anonymous rhetor (Spengel, III, 211).

⁴Apollonius Dyscolus De constr. ii. 14 in Immanuel Bekker, Apollonii Alexandrini De constructione orationis (Berlin: Reimer, 1817), pp. 121-24; Herodianus (Spengel, III, 94).

⁵Apollonius Dyscolus De constr. ii. 14 (Bekker, pp. 123 f.) confines the term AK to the occurrence of the common element before the copulative conjunction.

⁶Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius i. 246 in Carolus Wendel, Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium (Berlin: Weidmann, 1935), p. 29; Apollonius Rhodius i. 811 (Wendel, p. 70); Callimachus Hymn iii. 33-36 in Otto Schneider, Callimachea (Leipzig: Teubner, 1870-73), II, 117; Callimachus Hymn iv. 296-99 (Schneider, I, 130); Hymn v. 13-17 (Schneider, I, 131); Aristophanes Lysistrata 1019 in William G. Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica (London: Macmillan and Company, 1896-1905), II, 229 (see Rutherford, III, 321-24 for discussion of scholia on AK); Sophocles Electra 182 in Petrus N. Papageorgius, Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888), p. 112; Euripides Hecuba 211 in Eduard Schwartz, Scholia in Euripidem (Berlin: Reimer, 1887-91), I, 30 (see Schwartz, II, 413, for list of Euripidean scholia on AK).

⁷Eustathii Commentarii (Leipzig: Weizel, 1825-28), III, 212 f.

cites Homeric instances of AK, in some of which the common element, either in the first or in the second member, suggests a related notion in the other member.¹

The application of the terms ellipsis or zeugma to structure in which an expression is common to two or more members of a sentence persisted from the time of the revival of classical learning² well into the nineteenth century.³ Since 1833, when Mehlhorn's treatise on AK in the Greek language appeared,⁴ the figure has been the subject of separate treatment in various treatises and articles. A brief review of these discussions will reveal considerable diversity of opinion regarding the scope of the AK figure. Mueller,⁵ Koldewey,⁶ and Boldt⁷ sought to limit the application of the term AK, as a figure, at least, to instances in which the common element occurs at the beginning of the second member (or other member than the first); and Leo,⁸ followed by

¹E.g., Iliad iii. 326 f.; xii. 319 f.: Wilhelm Dindorf, Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1875-77), III, 428-30.

²See Julius Caesar Scaliger, De causis linguae Latinae (Heidelberg: apud P. Santandreaum, 1584), p. 431; Franciscus Sanctius [Sanchez], Minerva (Amsterdam: Hengst, 1809), pp. 862, 691.

³Cf. the title of the treatise of Georg Wichert: Ueber die Ergänzung elliptischer Satztheile aus Correspondierenden im Lateinischen (Programm, Guben, 1862); examples similar to those cited by Wichert were treated under the term brachylogia by Ludwig Doederlein, Commentatio de brachylogia sermonis Graeci (Erlangen, 1831).

⁴Friedrich Mehlhorn, Schematis AK ratio et usus quidam in Graeca lingua (Programm, Glogau, 1833): I do not have access to this work. It was reviewed by Sommer in ZAW, III (1836), 97-104.

⁵Ernst Mueller, Observationum Horatianarum particula (Halle, 1862): I do not have access to this work. Such knowledge as I have of its nature is derived chiefly from citations in the work of Van Konijnenburg and from references in Aken's treatise (see p. 4, n. 4).

⁶F. Koldewey, "Die Figura AK bei Catull, Tibull, Propertius, und Horaz," ZGW, XXXI (1877), 337-58; W. Hirschfelder, "Zur Literatur des Horatius," ZGW, XXIII (1869), 353 ff., had applied the term AK to the occurrence of the common element at any point in the second member.

⁷Heinrich Boldt, De liberiore linguae Graecae et Latinae collocatione verborum (diss., Göttingen, 1884), pp. 69-78.

⁸Friedrich Leo, Analecta Plautina, De figuris Sermonis, I (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1896), pp. 4 f.: a few Plautine instances in which the common element appears in the first member are appended, pp. 44-48.

Düring,¹ was largely in agreement with these scholars. Even in the relatively recent dissertation of Petersson on the text of Justin,² the term AK is similarly restricted. Clemm,³ Aken,⁴ and Van Konijnenburg⁵ took exception to the limited sense which Mueller and Koldewey had allowed the term AK, as figure, although Clemm still allowed but four positions for the common element, and Van Konijnenburg refused to consider certain collocations figurative.⁶ E. Baehrens,⁷ Kroll,⁸ and Klotz⁹ devoted particular attention to AK of correlatives and prepositions in the second member. The dissertation of Grimm¹⁰ notes only instances in which a word may be construed in more than one way. This limited application of the term AK is based upon a definition of the figure by Schmalz¹¹ which does not appear in the Leumann-Hofmann revision of the Stolz-Schmalz Latin Grammar.¹² The term is not consistently used in this revision: Hofmann's formal definition leaves no room for the appearance of the common element in the first member;¹³ elsewhere, the term AK is used to designate precisely this kind of

¹Theodor Düring, De Vergilii sermone epico (diss., Göttingen, 1905), pp. 56-60.

²Axel Petersson, De epitoma Iustini quaestiones criticae (diss., Upsala, 1926), pp. 81-93.

³Clemm, pp. 114 ff.

⁴O. Aken, De figurae AK usu apud Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium (Programm, Schwerin, 1884).

⁵Van Konijnenburg, p. 82. ⁶Ibid., pp. 30 ff.

⁷"Ad panegyricos Latinos observationes," Mnemosyne, Nova Series, XXXVIII (1910), 395-400; "Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax," Philologus, Suppl. XII (1912), 235-99; "Vermischte Bemerkungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Sprache," Glotta, IX (1917-18), 178-83.

⁸Wilhelm Kroll, "Randbemerkungen," RhM, LXIX (1914), 95-100.

⁹Alfred Klotz, "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen Stellen in Ciceros Reden," Glotta, VI (1914-15), 216-20.

¹⁰John Crawford Milton Grimm, The Construction AK in the Works of Horace (dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1928).

¹¹Friedrich Stolz-J. H. Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik (4th ed.; Munich: Beck, 1910), p. 686.

¹²Mann Leumann-J. B. Hofmann, Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik (5th ed.; Munich: Beck, 1928).

¹³Leumann-Hofmann, p. 848.

structure.¹ The principle of the AK scheme has been the basis of comments too numerous to catalogue fully on the part of editors, grammarians, and the writers of articles, although the term AK has not always been used.²

Clearly, Mueller and those who adopted his point of view could not base their restriction of the term AK on the statements of ancient authorities, or on the generality of examples which these authorities cited.³ There was equally little basis for distinguishing between figurative and non-figurative AK. So far as I can determine, these scholars fell into the error of considering AK from the standpoint of modern languages: that such is the case is evidenced by the eagerness with which Koldewey seized upon Goethe's verses:

mir sollt' er um die köstlichen Gewänder,
nicht feil um einen Königsmantel sein,

and upon Luther's phrase "zu Lob und seiner Ehren," with a word order which is abnormal from the standpoint of modern German, as parallels to, e.g., Horace Carmina i. 12. 10, "fluminum lapsus celerisque ventos [sc. celeris lapsus]." Koldewey held that this arrangement brought the thought to a climax, and that, if the common epithet preceded two nouns, it emphasized the quality of the things designated, whereas the attribute was somewhat sup-

¹E.g., Leumann-Hofmann, pp. 637, 849 (remark in bibliography regarding Aken's treatise).

²E.g., Dissen on Tibullus i. 1. 51; Nitzsch on Odyssey xii. 27; Schneidewin on Sophocles Electra 105 f.; Oedipus Rex 802 f.; Oedipus Col. 1399; Wolff on Sophocles Electra 105; Fritzsche on Theocritus viii. 45 f.; x. 35; xxii. 68; Naeke on Callimachus Hymn iii. 24 (in Opuscula, II, 72); Schneider on Callimachus Hymn iii. 24 (Callimachea, I, 206); Meineke on Theocritus xv. 79; Gertz on Seneca De breuitate vitae 7. 1 (6. 5) (Studia critica in L. Annaei Senecae Dialogos, pp. 30 f.); Gertz on Seneca De clementia i. 5 (L. Annaei Senecae libri De beneficiis et De clementia, p. 264); Haupt on Seneca Apocolocyntosis 8. 2 (Opuscula, II, 283 f.); Kühner (definition of AK: Ausführliche Grammatik der Griech. Sprache [2d ed.], II, 1066); Haase (definition: Vorlesungen, I, 203-7); Madvig on Livy xlv. 39. 4 (Emendationes Livianae, pp. 746 f.); Vahlen (Opuscula, I, 453-58, Aristotelis De arte poetica liber 3, pp. 105 f.); Wilamowitz on Euripides Hercules furens 238 f.; Munro on Lucretius i. 15 f. (4th ed., II, 24 f.); Hagendahl on Ammianus Marcellinus xxv. 3. 4 (in Strena, pp. 84-86).

³Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 4, noted that the scholiasts rarely used the term AK in connection with instances in which the common element was situated at the beginning of the second member.

pressed if it followed the first or final noun of a pair.¹ But Koldewey's examples are not in accord with his canons; in, e.g., Horace Carmina iii. 11. 19, "spiritus taeter saniesque"; Carmina i. 21. 13, "miseram famem pestemque," the second noun has in itself more of the quality of the attribute than has the first: thus the order should be climactic, i.e., the adjective should have been placed before the final noun, if such a position wrought any such effect on the Roman hearer or reader as Koldewey supposed. The fact is, that the metre simply will not permit of such transposition, nor of a different position for the adjective in Carmina i. 12. 10. The modern reader has no great difficulty in seeing that the epithet applies to both nouns in the foregoing instances, but, in such an instance as Vergil Eclogues iii. 3. 33, "est mihi namque domi pater, est iniusta noverca," only the context reveals that both the father and the stepmother are unjust, and that, if this is not the case, there is no point in the mention of the father. To a mind accustomed to similar locutions (obviously more frequent in a highly inflected language) the Vergilian passage could have offered no great difficulty. As concerns Latin word order, I can see no reason to consider (a) the order of Ecl. iii. 3. 33 more difficult or bolder than (b) the (perhaps more prosaic) order of the sentence, sunt mihi iniustus pater et noverca. In English, as in German, the equivalent of (a) is not idiomatic, the equivalent of (b) is regular. It is mere grammatical schematizing to suppose that in (a) the Roman hearer or reader completed a thought when he reached the word pater, and then corrected it on reaching noverca by supplying iniustus with pater. It is even more mechanical to suppose that such a hearer or reader in (b) supplied iniusta with noverca. Yet the explanation here suggested of (a) is more reasonable than that of (b), thanks to the comma, which the Roman did not possess. Is it not likely that in (a) the Roman swung through the entire verse in Vergil, unimpeded by the equivalent of the modern comma,² and that in (b) the words pater et noverca constituted a hyphenated unit, modified

¹ZGW, XXXI (1877), 349 f.

²In this particular example, it is true, the repetition of est serves in some degree to sever the members and to reinforce the AK figure (see p. 11 of this dissertation), but I maintain that the context is too closely knit to necessitate readjustment on the part of the hearer or reader.

by iniustus, the effect of which is simply "unjust father-and-stepmother"? In any case, purely grammatical schematizing and description of effects in terms of supplying missing elements misrepresents the phenomenon. The conditions of a highly inflected language, of a seemingly intricate word order, and of an often highly rhetorical style cannot be appreciated from a purely grammatical point of view.

Thus, in Latin, an element (word, phrase, clause) may be expressed in one member and be "supplied," grammatically speaking, in another member, in a different case, number, mood, voice, or tense; or it may be that a word of a given grammatical category in one member leads to the suggestion in another member of a word which belongs to a different, if somewhat related, category.¹ These are not essential phases of the phenomenon of AK; they arise simply from the nature of an inflected language, and should be appreciated, not in terms of grammatical supplement, but as the result of stimulus and suggestion.

In close relation to Koldewey's theory that the situation of the common epithet before the final noun of a pair was a climactic arrangement, we should consider the "Law of Increasing Members," on which some modern authorities base AK of the common element in the second member.² This Law, if it is to be linked with the statements of Cicero, Quintilian, and Demetrius to which Hofmann refers, must imply that in Greek and Latin there is a recognizable tendency to place (a) the longest, and (b) the most vivid or emphatic expression in a series of parallel expressions at the end. Quintilian cites Cicero Philippica ii. 63, "istis faucibus, istis lateribus, ista gladiatoria totius corporis firmitate," as an instance of an arrangement in which the most vivid expression is reserved until the end.³ Examples of similar arrangement are cited by Demetrius On Style 50. Plainly the chief concern of both rhetors is with the vividness, not with the length of the final expression. Cicero, on the other hand, gives defi-

¹As, e.g., nostra suggests nos in Ovid Met. xiv. 259-61: nostraque aduantes comitant vestigia, donec excipiunt famulae perque atria marmore tecta ad dominam ducunt.

²Leumann-Hofmann, pp. 804 f.; cf. Wilhelm Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax (Heidelberg: Winter, 1931), p. 178.

³Quintilian Inst. ix. 4. 23.

nite instruction that the longest expression of a series should be placed at the end.¹ If the AK scheme is to be linked with these rhetorical rules, then the common element should appear in the longest and most vivid expression of a series, and this expression will occur last in the series. The common element not infrequently appears in the final, most vivid, and longest member, e.g., Vergil Ecl. iv. 31-33:

pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis,
quae temptare Thetis ratibus, quae cingere muris
oppida, quae iubeant telluri infindere sulcos

(the common principal verb is placed with the infinitive which indicates the culminating event in chronological sequence); Propertius ii. 1. 3, "non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo" (Apollo is the more important divinity). But the common element often appears in the first member; if the common element contributes to the length of the member in which it stands, the Law of Increasing Members is shown to have no very close relation to the AK scheme. Thus, in Propertius i. 6. 1 f.:

non ego nunc Hadriae vereor mare noscere tecum,
Tulle, neque Aegaeo ducere vela salo,

the first member is appreciably longer than the second; certainly the second member contains no element which would serve to make it more vivid than the first: both the Adriatic and the Aegean are traditional scenes of storm and shipwreck, both feared by the seafarer.² Moreover, the common element may appear in a second member which is no more vivid than the first, e.g., Propertius ii. 3. 43, "sive illam Hesperis, sive illam ostendet Eois . . . "; ii. 22. 34, "hic ego Pelides, hic ferus Hector ego." A third passage of Propertius shows two instances of AK: the common element is in (a) the second member and (b) the first member: Propertius ii. 1. 43-45,

navita de ventis, de tauris narret arator,
enumerat miles vulnera, pastor oves;
nos contra angusto versantes proelia lecto.

The writer places no more emphasis on the story of the ploughman than on that of the sailor, no more emphasis on the reckoning of the soldier than on that of the shepherd: these are examples offered by way of contrast to vs. 45. The common element may appear

¹Cicero De oratore iii. 186.

²Cf., e.g., Horace Carmina ii. 14. 14; 16. 1 f.; iii. 3. 5; 9. 22 f.; 29. 63.

in the shorter expression, as in Vergil Aen. iv. 11, "quam sese ore ferens! quam forti pectore et armis!" Here it might be argued that the common element appears with the less vivid expression.¹ This is certainly the case in Vergil Aen. ii. 337 f.:

. . . . quo tristis Erinyes,
quo fremitus vocat et sublatum ad aethera clamor.

In the light of these examples, and many others like them, we are justified in denying the application of the "Law of Increasing Members" to the AK scheme.

Qualities of style, whether inherent or developed through conscious rhetoric, lead to apparent complexity of the phenomenon of AK which a modern reader only with difficulty learns to appreciate. The mind of the Roman hearer or reader was habituated to a balanced and symmetrical style, and was thus sensitive to likeness, and equally to unlikeness; consequently a thought expressed in one of two members may, in a given context, suggest in the other member not merely the same, but a closely related or even opposite thought, which the writer or speaker leaves unexpressed because, through the general balance of structure, he has suggested to the hearer or reader the missing approximation or opposition. A simple form of this structure is seen in Propertius ii. 30. 27 f.:

illic aspicies scopulis haerere sorores,
et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iovis.²

If we were to interpret this passage in the light of formal grammar, we should insist on "supplying" or "understanding" audies from aspicies; but the two members, constituted by the distribution of infinitives in parallel structure, obviously form part of a larger whole in which the general notion of hearing is suggested in the second member by that of seeing, which is expressed in the first. The modern reader finds such an example of extreme interest, as a departure from formal grammar. I shall cite some Ovidian examples of this nature. Insofar as, logically speaking, the verb which is expressed evokes a similar, but broader notion under which both members can be subsumed, we have not only AK, but what

¹Cf. Propertius ii. 4. 17 f.:

non hic herba valet, non hic nocturna Cytasis,
non Perimedaeae gramina cocta manus.

²Cf. Iliad xii. 319 f. (" . . . and they eat fat sheep and wine, choice, honey-sweet").

is commonly termed zeugma as well;¹ but insofar as a verb in the first member suggests a verbal idea in the second, we have simply AK of a common element in the first member. Similarly, an adjective or adverb may suggest a related or opposite notion in another member; or the pronoun of one person may suggest that of another. Leo's comment on Ovid Epist. vi. 135 f.,

prodidit illa patrem: rapui de clade Thoanta:
deseruit Colchos: me mea Lemnos habet,

is instructive: "Hic nihil magis sermonis vigori necessarium, quam ut illa et ego non re sed verbo quoque inter se opponantur, priore autem loco quod ego deficit, altero deficit illa, comparet me."² I cannot agree that the Roman hearer or reader would verbally "supply" the "missing" pronouns, but I have no doubt that habituation to balance and symmetry led him to feel their emphasis, as Leo implies. Leo does not make it clear whether he means that ego "understood" in the first verse is suggested by me in the second verse, and that illa "understood" with deseruit in the second verse is suggested by illa in the first; but either of these verses might stand alone and the emphasis would still be clear, as will appear from similar examples which I shall cite in the main body of this dissertation. Leo's comment is important, however, because it shows that a feeling for balance and emphasis are of prime importance in the identification of many instances of AK which are foreign to normal modes of expression in modern European languages.

In modern English, AK of a word in the first member is not unfamiliar: witness a verse taken at random from Alexander Pope's "Satires": "What walls can guard me, or what shades can hide,"³ although this position of a common object is more difficult than a similar position of the verb, which is seen, e.g., in the following verses from Herrick's "Corinna's Going A-Maying":

Many a green gown has been given,
Many a kiss, both odd and even.⁴

¹See Korn-Müller-Ehwald, Die Metamorphosen des P. Ovidius (Vol. I, 9th ed.; Vol. II, 4th ed.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1915-16), on Met. 11. 312 f.

²Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 26.

³In The Le Gallienne Book of English Verse (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1923), p. 160.

⁴Ibid., p. 111.

Location of a common element in the second member elsewhere than at the end is strange to our ears, even more strange when a different form of expression is to be "supplied"; but, in the second verse of the following passage taken from Thomas Campion's "Follow Your Saint":

All that I sang still to her praise did tend,
Still she was first, still she my songs did end,¹

it is evident that any intelligent English reader will understand "in my songs" in the first member from the words of the second member, without conscious readjustment: especially as the preceding verse states the theme and lessens the difficulty. We must be on our guard against ascribing a need for readjustment to the Roman hearer or reader, when it comes to similar passages in Latin.

There are, in Latin, factors which clearly enhance the AK figure. A certain number of examples in any given Latin author will be of the two types exemplified in (a) Vergil Aen. vi. 323, ". . . Cocytus stagna alta vides Stygiamque paludem," and in (b) Propertius iii. 7. 29, "ite, rates curvas et leti texite causas," where the verb is expressed in (a) the first and (b) the second member. Here two members in parallel structure are joined by the copulative conjunction. Similar structure is seen with the disjunctive: there is manifestly only a slight difference between the following two sentences:

(a) omnis amor magnus sed aperto in coniuge maior
(Propertius iv. 3. 49),

(b) omnis amor magnus et aperto in coniuge maior,
especially if the modern comma before sed be avoided. Neither the copulative nor the disjunctive emphasize balance between the members: hence the fact that balance exists and that there is a common element which is, so to speak, out of balance, does not emerge so clearly in instances of the foregoing type as in some others. On the other hand, the AK scheme may be reinforced by the repetition of the same word, phrase, or clause. Thus, in Tibullus i. 4. 5 f.:

mudus et hibernae producis frigora brumae,
mudus et aestivi tempora sicca canis

(common element in the first member), and in Vergil Eclogues v. 76, "dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit . . ."
(common element in the second member), the balance between the

¹Ibid., p. 83.

two members is emphasized and the common element, which is "out of balance" is thrown into clearer relief by the repetition of elements which might themselves have been expressed but once and thus have been AK. Such a scheme, i.e., anaphora, might be considered the opposite of AK. Similarly, identical correlatives¹ emphasize the balanced structure and give prominence to the common element, e.g., Catullus lxii. 47, ". . . nec pueris iucunda manet, nec cara puellis"; although here we are but one step removed from the use of the copulative.² Asyndeton, insofar as it severs the members, performs a function similar to that of anaphora and identical correlatives, e.g., Tibullus (Lygdamus) iii. 1. 7, "carmine formosae, pretio capiuntur avarae." Structure similar to asyndeton results from the use of non-identical correlatives, e.g., Ovid Met. iii. 205, "pudor hoc, timor impedit illud." Naturally, the element may be compound, and consist of several words, e.g., Propertius ii. 1. 3, "non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo," or of a clause, e.g., Vergil Aen. i. 287, ". . . imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris." Or, the common element may apply to more than two members, e.g., Propertius ii. 1. 37 f.:

Thessalus infernis, superis testatur Achilles,
hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden;

or may appear in one protasis or apodosis of a pair of balanced protases and apodoses, e.g., Propertius ii. 32. 1 f.:

qui videt, is peccat: qui te non viderit ergo,
non cupiet.

(In both these instances, the common element is AK in the second member as regards preceding context, AK in the first member as regards subsequent context.) We may safely suppose that instances which resemble these last two show a somewhat bolder use of the AK scheme than do instances which resemble those previously cited, simply because the common element must apply to an extraordinarily large range of context.

The rhetorical effects of AK reach their climax when, in

¹For the purposes of this dissertation, I have found it necessary to distinguish between identical correlatives (e.g., aut aut) and non-identical correlatives (e.g., hic ille), since the former involve the repetition of an element, and the latter do not.

²Cf. Propertius ii. 16. 51, "non haec Pleiades faciunt neque aquosus Orion," where neque is copulative.

balanced structure, there is an intricate pattern of AK in which the common elements are frequently not confined to any single member, but are distributed over two or more members, e.g., Propertius i. 6. 29, "non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis" (subject pronoun and auxiliary verb in the first member, participle and predicate adjective in the second: the scheme is enhanced by repetition of non); Propertius i. 8. 39 f.:

hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis,
sed potui blandi carminis obsequio

(three members). Sometimes a word of opposite or related meaning is "understood" in such a scheme, as in Propertius iii. 17. 9:

hoc mihi, quod veteres custodit in ossibus ignes,
Funera sanabunt aut tua vina malum:

hoc malum is lovesickness, which, as the poet has already suggested, Bacchus has power to heal;¹ the present verse, with the antithesis "death or your wine shall heal this malady" introduces a new thought: clearly "my death" is meant. An exceedingly intricate scheme of this nature appears in Propertius ii. 25. 45, ". . . illaque plebeio vel sit bombycis² amictu." A merely superficial inspection shows that the subject illa is AK in the first member, the verb and the word amictu are AK in the second member. It is of importance to note that the preceding context has suggested a contrast between "white" and "dark."³ The reader may well expect that some similar contrast will be developed in the present verse: but the grounds for contrast between the ideas conveyed by the words plebeio and bombycis (the bombyx is a white

¹Propertius iii. 17. 3, 5f.:

tu potes insanæ Veneris comescere fastus.
per te iunguntur, per te solvuntur amantes:
tu vitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, meo.

²sandycis codd.: bombycis Heimreich: Christian Heimreich, "Novae quaestiones Propertianae" in Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschellii (Leipzig: Teubner, 1864-67), p. 670: the middle syllable of the word sandycis should be short on the Greek model, cf. Gratius Cynegetica 86, "interdum libyci fuscantur [fugantur codd., fucantur Baehrens] sandice pinnae." But Heimreich was mistaken in his opinion that the contrast suggested by plebeio and bombycis was necessarily one of material rather than of color: cf. Cicero Pro Sestio 19, "vestitus asperae hac purpura plebeia ac paene fusca"

³Propertius ii. 25. 41 f.:

vidistis pleno teneram candore puellam,
vidistis fusco: ducit uterque color.

garment¹) are not immediately apparent, to a modern reader, at least. There is no apparent logical relation between social caste and color. On the principle of the AK scheme, however, the notion "dark" is suggested in the first member by the word bombycis: moreover, since the bombyx is manifestly a luxurious garment, the notion "patrician" or "noble" is suggested by the word plebeio. The antithesis between plebeio amictu and bombycis amictu is now clear: the plebeian (and dark) garb is contrasted with the white (and patrician).²

Thus far, our general view has extended only to instances of AK in balanced structure. AK in unbalanced structure remains to be considered. There are two chief types.

(1) The common element may be expressed elsewhere than in the sentence in which, grammatically speaking, it is understood. In Vergil Aen. i. 738 f.:

tum Bitiae dedit increpitans: ille impiger hausit
spumantem pateram ,

the logical object of dedit is expressed in remote preceding context (vs. 729, ". . . implevitque mero pateram . . ."), and reappears in vs. 739. The very remoteness of the expressed object, together with the fact that sentences in which it is not "understood" intervene, heightens what we may call the boldness of the figure. Furthermore, a mind habituated to balanced structure would be on less familiar ground and experience greater difficulty in distinguishing the common element when the structure is unbalanced. In our last example, the same case as has been expressed is "understood." From the standpoint of modern interest, at least, a somewhat bolder use is made of the AK scheme when a different case from that which is expressed is "understood," e.g., Vergil Aen. i. 530, "est locus, Hesperiam Graii cognomine dicunt." Here formal grammar would demand that locum be understood as the object of dicunt: the expression manifestly departs from the canons of formal grammar. In the main body of this dissertation, I shall note Ovidian examples of such departure. Only

¹Propertius ii. 3. 15, ". . . nec si qua Arabio lucet bombyce puella [sc. cepit, v. 9]."

²Cf. Horace Carmina ii. 3. 9, ". . . quo pinus ingens albaque populus," i.e., "tall (and dark) pine," "white (and small) poplar."

rarely, in this paratactic¹ structure, does the common element appear in context subsequent to that in which it is "understood." The following examples from Propertius are noteworthy:

Propertius ii. 24b. 35 f.:

tu mea compones et dices: 'ossa, Properti,
haec tua sunt';²

Propertius ii. 25. 41 f.:

vidistis pleno teneram candore puellam
vidistis fusco: ducit uterque color³

(teneram puellam AK in the first member). Frequently the noun which is expressed in preceding context is, so to speak, represented in subsequent context by an adjective or participle, e.g., Vergil Aen. i. 83-85:

incubuerunt mari, totumque a sedibus imis
una Eurusque Notusque ruunt creberque procellis
Africus,

Aen. i. 343, 345:

huic [sc. Elissae] coniunx Sychaeus erat
. . . .
cui pater intactam dederat;

and here, it must be admitted, the adjective or participle to a certain degree performs the function of a determinative or demonstrative pronoun.⁴ Nevertheless, insofar as the person or thing which is thus designated is determined by a word in preceding context, we are still within the range of the AK figure. However, a normally transitive verb may be used without any apparent object,

¹Cf. Aken, op. cit., p. 7: "At in figuris habendum est [Aken would exclude examples which do not rouse modern interest from the sphere of AK, qua figure] cum aut secundarium ex principali aut alterum colon ex altero paratactice durias suppletur aut longius repetenda est omissa vox."

²See Max Rothstein, Die Elegien des Sex. Propertius (2d ed.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1920-24), ad loc.; Rothstein cites Propertius ii. 25. 41; 26b. 25 (carmina understood from carmina); 34. 29 (senis understood from senex); iv. 4. 73 (dies understood from dies) as parallel instances.

³fusco 0; fuscam Mueller, Butler: H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, The Elegies of Propertius (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 233: "If fusco (0) be read, we must supply candore which produces a harsh oxymoron, scarcely to be met by paraphrasing 'a brilliant brunette.'" The fact that color is suggested in subsequent context is thus overlooked, but cf. Rothstein, Propertius, 2d ed., ad loc.

⁴A similar function of the adjective or pronoun is seen in balanced structure, e.g., Propertius ii. 34. 65, "cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graei."

as in Ovid Epist. x. 97, ". . . sive colunt habitantque viri, diffidimus illis," where the interest of the passage lies chiefly in the implied comparison between men and beasts (cf. vs. 96, "destituor rapidis praeda cibusque feris"), and where no reader needs to be informed of the place whose possible inhabitants, Ariadne thinks, might be wild beasts or men. Moreover, the limitations of verse structure demand economy of language. In Vergil Aen. i. 70, ". . . aut age diversos et disice corpora ponto," there is nothing in the context which explicitly identifies the persons who are designated by the participle diversos, although the preceding context suggests their identity clearly enough, cf. vs. 67, "gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat aequor." Instances analogous to the last two do not, of course, belong to the sphere of AK.

(2) The second type of AK in unbalanced structure is akin to the first, but here the structure is more closely knit, and consists of a subordinate and a principal clause, in one of which the common element is expressed, or over both of which the common elements are distributed. The common element may be suggested by preceding context, e.g., Vergil Aen. vi. 311 f.:

quam multae glomerantur aves, ubi frigidus annus
trans pontem fugat et terris inmittit apricis,

or by subsequent context, e.g., Propertius iv. 7. 7, "eosdem habuit secum, quibus est elata capillis." The distributive structure is seen in, e.g., Plautus Captivi 179 f.:

. . . nisi qui meliorem adferet
quae mihi atque amicis placeat condicio magis.¹

To type (2) belong also instances in which the common element appears in one phrase, and is suggested in another which is not in parallel structure, e.g., Lucretius v. 1110 f.:

divisere atque dedere
pro facie culusque

(sc. cuique divisere atque dedere)² (the common element is in subsequent context, i.e., in the second member). Here, too, a noun in preceding context may be represented by an adjective or

¹Cited in Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 20.

²Cited by Munro on Lucretius i. 15 f.:

ita capta lepore

te sequitur quo quamque inducere pergis,

with other examples of similar structure: H. A. J. Munro, T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex (4th ed.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1908-10), II, 24 f.

participle, e.g., Vergil *Aen.* 1. 405 f.:

ille ubi matrem
adgnovit, tali fugientem est voce secutus.¹

The entire passage *Aen.* 1. 405-10 might be cited as an instance of type (1). After the speech of Aeneas, vss. 407-9, the narrative is resumed with the words talibus incusatus (vs. 410): the logical object of incusatus is matrem. Examples of types (1) and (2) involving verbs are not, of course, lacking; e.g., Propertius iii. 6. 11-13:

nec speculum strato vidisti, Lygdame, lecto?
ornabant niveas nullane gemma comas?
ac maestam teneris vestem pendere lacertis²

(sc. pendere vidisti); Tibullus i. 6. 53 f.:

attigerit, labentur opes, ut vulnere nostro
sanguis³

(labuntur is suggested in the subordinate clause in a different sense).

The foregoing discussion has aimed to give a general survey of those types of expression to which the term AK may fittingly be applied, as well as to deal with certain views regarding the nature and scope of the figure with which the present writer is not in agreement. Such considerations are a necessary preliminary to a definition of AK, which follows. The AK figure consists in the presence (in one of several members) of a word, phrase, or clause which is suggested, but not expressed, in another member, either in the same sense which it bore as expressed, or in a related or opposite sense. By members we mean not only parallel clauses, or parts of a clause which are in parallel structure, but also sentences which have no close grammatical relation, disparate clauses, and phrases which are not in mutually parallel structure. Manifestly, at least two members are necessary for the existence of the figure, otherwise the term AK has no meaning, since the notion of community implies participation among several units: in true ellipsis there is no such participation, since no element is present which can apply to several members. In our exposition we shall distinguish:

¹The quasi-pronominal use of participles is, of course, not confined to poetry: cf. Caesar *De bello Gallico* ii. 9. 1, "nostri autem, si ab illis initium transeundi fieret, ut impeditos aggrederentur, parati in armis erant"; cf. also Livy xxi. 4. 7.

²Cited by Aken, op. cit., p. 6.

³Ibid., p. 6.

(Chapter i): Instances in which the common element is simple or compound, and is expressed in the first member (i.e., instances in which a "missing" element is suggested by preceding context).

(Chapter ii): Instances in which the common element is simple or compound, and is expressed in the second member (i.e., instances in which a "missing" element is suggested by subsequent context).

(Chapter iii): Instances in which the common element is compound and its parts are distributed between two (or among more than two) members.

For convenience of exposition, we shall arrange the material under grammatical categories, although these have no real bearing on the phenomenon. We shall thus, in each chapter, follow the general practice of assembling the instances in which a noun is the common element under one heading, and treat the other grammatical categories in like fashion. The minor headings will indicate external grammatical or stylistic features which (a) diminish or (b) emphasize the effect of AK, in particular, the use (a) of the copulative or disjunctive, (b) of correlatives, anaphora, and asyndeton, and the appearance of the common element in unbalanced structure of the two general types mentioned above. We shall also call attention to instances in which there are more than two members. Only incidentally, and solely for the sake of modern interest, will the position of the common element in regard to the member in which it is expressed receive mention.

The present treatise is based almost exclusively upon a portion only of the entire Ovidian Corpus, viz., on the Metamorphoses, Amores, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris, and Epistulae. The text is that of Ehwald, unless the present writer finds good reason to depart therefrom. Frequent reference has been made to Magnus' text of the Metamorphoses,¹ to Lafaye's text of the Metamorphoses in the "Budé" series,² and to Palmer's text of the

¹Hugo Magnus, P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914).

²Georges Lafaye, Ovide Les métamorphoses (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1928-30), 3 vols.

Epistulae.¹ Examples are chosen, not with a view to comprehensiveness, but with the purpose of showing (a) the range and (b) the intricacy of the AK figure as seen in the portion of the Ovidian Corpus which is indicated above. So far as is practicable, the arrangement is such that the more commonplace instances are treated first.

¹Arthur Palmer, P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898).

CHAPTER I

THE COMMON ELEMENT EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST MEMBER

I. Verbs

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

A large number of instances are of extreme simplicity,
e.g., Met. 11. 647 f.:

equa deo corpus fies exsanguis deusque,
qui modo corpus eras;

Epist. vii. 145, "non patrium Simoenta petis, sed Thybridas undas":
and among such instances we shall include the following: Met.
xiii. 83 f.:

. . . . non tu tantum terroris, Ulixee,
sed fortes etiam;

Met. xv. 319 f.:

Cui non audita est obscenae Salmacis undae
Aethiopesque lacus?

Met. xv. 818 f.:

ut deus accedat caelo templisque colatur
tu facies natusque tuus,

where, grammatically speaking, the verb agrees in person or number with but one of two subjects. Several elements are AK in the following typical instances: Met. ix. 134 f.:

. . . . actaque magni
Herculis inplerant terras odiumque novercae;

Met. vii. 92 f.:

. . . . nec me ignorantia veri
decipiet, sed amor;

Epist. x. 142 f.:

debita sit facto gratia nulla meo,
sed ne poena quidem;

Amor. i. 9. 21 f.:

saepe soporatos invadere profruit hostes
caedere et armata vulgus inerme manu.

The pluperfect tense of the verb is expressed, the perfect implied in Epist. i. 37 f.:

omnia namque tuo senior te quaerere misso
rettulerat nato Nestor, at ille mihi

(sc. rettulit, cf. vs. 39, "rettulit et ferro Rhesumque Dolonaque caesos"). The passage Met. xv. 255-57:

. . . . nascique vocatur
incipere esse aliud, quam quod fuit ante, morique
desinere illud idem

involves AK both of a principal verb and of an infinitive which is not dependent on the principal verb. If the distributed non-common elements (whose distribution forms the members) are not in strictly parallel structure, the balance of the sentence is slightly disturbed, e.g., Met. x. 152-54:

. . . . puerosque canamus
dilectos superis inconcessisque puellas
ignibus attonitas meruisse libidine poenam:¹

here pueros in the first member is balanced in the second, not by puellas, but by the infinitive meruisse and its subject puellas, and all the modifiers of these two elements. The following Ovidian examples show AK (a) of the verb, (b) of the verb and another element in the first of three members: Met. v. 265 f.:

silverum lucos circumspicit antiquarum
antraque et innumeris distinctas floribus herbas;

Met. iii. 522 f.:

. . . . et sanguine silvas
foedabis matremque tuam matrisque sorores.

(2) Repeated elements²

The common verb (verb AK, with or without other common elements) is thrown into relief: by the use of correlatives which distinguish the members, e.g., Ars iii. 317 f.:

et modo marmoreis referant audita theatris,
et modo Niliacis carmina lusa modis;

Ars i. 324, "altera quod bos est, altera vecta bove" (causal conjunction also AK); Ars i. 493 f.:

et modo praecedas facito, modo terga sequaris,
et modo festines et modo lentus eas!

(four members³); Epist. i. 40, ". . . . utque sit hic somno pro-

¹Cf. Met. xiii. 481 f. (acc. dir. obj. in first member, ind. qu. in second member).

²See Introduction, pp. 11 f.

³Cf. Met. iii. 448 f.:

nec nos mare separat ingens
nec via nec montes nec clausis moenia portis.

ditus, ille dolo" (non-identical correlatives); Ars ii. 373-76:

sed neque fulvus aper media tam saevus in ira est
... ..
nec lea ...

nec brevis ignaro vipera laesa pede

(three members: attributive adjective fulvus¹ and predicate adjective saevus, grammatically speaking, "understood" in a different gender);² by anaphora, e.g., Met. ii. 812 f.:

saepe mori voluit, ne quicquam tale videret,
saepe velut crimen rigido narrare parenti;

Met. v. 440 f.:

illam non udis veniens Aurora capillis
cessantem vidit, non Hesperus

(verb and direct object AK); Amor. iii. 6. 9 f.:

quid properasse iuvat, quid parca dedisse quieti
tempora, quid nocti conseruisse diem . . . ?

(three members). The scheme of anaphora is only partially followed in some instances, e.g., Met. xii. 501-3:

quid membra inmania prosunt?
quid geminae vires et quod fortissima rerum
in nobis duplex natura animalia iunxit?

in others, the copulative may be used as well as the repeated element, but the effect remains that of anaphora: e.g., Met. vii. 436-38:

tellus Epidauria per te
clavigeram vidit Vulcani occumbere prolem,
vidit et inमितem Cephisias ora Procrusten;

Met. ii. 723 f.:

quanto splendidior quam cetera sidera fulget
Lucifer et quanto quam Lucifer aurea Phoebe.³

¹The epithet fulvus is frequently applied to the lion: cf., e.g., Epist. x. 85, "Forsitan et fulvos tellus alat ista leones"; cf. also Met. i. 304; x. 551; Fasti ii. 339.

²It is interesting to observe that the creatures mentioned in the first two members are relatively large, as contrasted with the viper, which is described as brevis. The possibility that brevis suggests its opposite cannot, then, be overlooked, although the matter is perhaps difficult of proof. The common thought which links all three members is that these three creatures, whatever their physical attributes, agree in being savage in wrath. Only sensitiveness to the AK figure reveals the full value of the sentence.

³In the remainder of this dissertation, examples similar to the above will be treated under the heading of anaphora. So far as the AK scheme is concerned, interest centers in the repetition of an element, not in the precise delimitation of the term anaphora.

Similarly, the structure is essentially that in which the members are distinguished by correlatives in Amor. i. 9. 8, "ille fores dominae servat, at ille ducis."

(3) Asyndetic structure

The following instances might be cited as showing either asyndeton or the repetition of an element: Amor. i. 10. 43 f.:

gratia pro rebus merito debetur inemptis;
pro male conducto gratia nulla toro;

Met. ii. 107 f.:

aureus axis erat, temo aurea, aurea summae
curvatura rotae, radiorum argenteus ordo

(four members). However, antithesis, more or less sharp (cf. the first example), and the emergence of two new elements in the second member (cf. the final member of the second example) are often characteristic of asyndetic structure which involves AK of a verb. In some instances, these characteristics are prominent, e.g., Met. i. 75, ". . . terra feras cepit, volucres agitabilis aër";¹ Met. ii. 239 f.:

quaerit Boeotia Dirce,
Argos Amymonen, Ephyre Pirenidas undas

(three members);² in others, they are wholly lacking, e.g., Amor. iii. 12. 27 f.:

fecimus Enceladon iaculantem mille lacertis,
ambiguae captos virginis ore viros;

Met. xi. 342 f.:

oraeque adunca dedit, curvos dedit unguibus hamos,
virtutem antiquam, maiores corpore vires

(three members). In the last example we note that the AK figure replaces the scheme which is the opposite of AK, i.e., the word dedit is first repeated, then inferred from the preceding member. Asyndeton may accompany the negation of the second member, e.g., Ars iii. 31, "saepe viri fallunt, tenerae non saepe puellae."³ Not unlike AK in asyndetic structure is the appearance of the

¹Cf. Met. i. 236; ii. 136 f.; iii. 232 f.; iv. 629 f.; v. 98 f.; vii. 662 f.; ix. 629; x. 571 f.; xiii. 301; xv. 250 f., 703 f.; Amor. i. 8. 77; iii. 6. 99; Ars ii. 588; Epist. iii. 69; ix. 157.

²Cf. Met. iv. 755 f.; ix. 498 f.; xiii. 144 f.; Met. i. 43 f. (four members).

³Cf. Ars i. 121. It may well be that "tender" suggests "hard," "unfeeling" in the first member: cf. note 2, p. 22.

common element in one of two parallel protases or apodoses, e.g.,
Met. vii. 677 f.:

certe si fraxinus esset,
fulva colore foret; si cornus, nodus inesset.¹

Both the subject pronoun and the principal verb of the first protasis are AK in Epist. i. 15-18:

sive quis Antilochum narrabat ab Hectore victum,
Antilochus nostri causa timoris erat;
sive Menoetiaden falsis cecidisse sub armis,
flebam successu posse carere dolos.

The passage Epist. xx. 63 f.:

non vis placare Dianam:
inmemor es nostri; non potes: illa tuist!

shows similar structure in parataxis: the infinitive placare and its object are common to both protases, the predicate adjective inmemor is common to both apodoses. A more complicated scheme appears in Amor. iii. 7. 47 f.:

optabam certe recipi: sum nempe receptus;
oscula Ferre: tuli; proximus esse: fui:

the principal verb which is common to three protases appears in the first; the elements oscula and proximus, which appear in the second and third protases, are inferred in the second and third apodoses, respectively, i.e., are AK in unbalanced structure. In Met. viii. 204 f.:

. . . . ne, si demissior ibis,
unda gravet pennas, si celsior, ignis adurat

(with AK of the conjunction ne), the verb of the first protasis is implied in the second protasis, the direct object in the first apodosis is implied in the second apodosis. I see no good reason why the disputed passage Met. vii. 508 f.:

nec dubie vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras
ducite, et omnia, quae rerum status iste mearum

may not be interpreted as showing similar balance of thought between two relative clauses and two principal clauses, of which the first relative clause suggests the verb of the second, and the first principal clause suggests the verb of the second. Hence it seems reasonable to interpret this passage as follows: nec dubie vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras ducite et omnia (vestra ducite), quae rerum status iste mearum(habet). Since the discussion of this passage must necessarily be somewhat more extended

¹Cf. Amor. ii. 4. 17 f.; iii. 11. 35.

than is the case with other passages which are cited in the main body of this chapter, I append such discussion to the present chapter in the form of an excursus.¹

B. Unbalanced Structure

(1) Common element in remote context

If the context in which the common element is situated is not far removed from that in which this element is clearly implied, balanced structure is approximated, as is the case in Met. xv. 495 f.:

. . . . utinamque exempla dolentem
non mea te possent relevare! sed et mea possunt.

There is disparity between the two clauses here cited: the first is a wish contrary to fact, the other is a statement of fact; but repetition of the adjective mea and of a form of the verb possum serves to give prominence and clarity to the common elements.

The passage Amor. iii. 12. 35-40:

Protea quid referam Thebanaque semina, dentes:
qui vomerent flammis ore, fuisse boves,
flere genis electra tuas, Auriga, sorores,
quaeque rates fuerint, nunc maris esse deas,
aversumque diem mensis furialibus Atrei
duraque percussam saxa secuta lyram?

shows both balanced structure (in the first verse) and AK of the verb and interrogative adverb in remote context. No connective links vs. 35 with subsequent context, and there is a change in the structure beginning with vs. 36, i.e., infinitives with subject accusative replace the accusative of the direct object.² A bolder use of the AK structure is made when the intervention of a second verb obscures the fact that the verb which is first expressed is implied in subsequent context, e.g., Amor. i. 15. 1-6:

quid mihi, Livor edax, ignavos obicis annos,
ingenique vocas carmen inertis opus;
non me more patrum, dum strenua sustinet aetas,
praemia militiae pulverulenta sequi,
nec me verbosas leges ediscere nec me
ingrato vocem prostituuisse foro?

Here the infinitives in vss. 3-6 are dependent on the verb obi-

¹See pp. 47 ff.

²Cf. Met. x. 152-54, cited on p. 21: in the latter instance, the members were more closely linked by the copulative conjunction.

cis,¹ which is not so readily inferred after the intrusion of vo-
cas as is, e.g., referam in Amor. iii. 12. 35-40, cited
above.

(2) Disparate clauses

The verb is expressed in the principal clause, and is im-
plied in the subordinate clause in the following typical instances:

(a) Relative clause.--Met. vi. 141, "defluxere comae, cum
quis et naris et aures."

(b) Clause of comparison.--Epist. xvi. 191, "errat, ut
ipsi"; Met. xi. 771-73:

visa fugit nymphe, veluti perterrita fulvum
cerva lupum longeque lacu deprensa relicto
accipitrem fluvialis anas

(three members).

(c) Temporal clauses.--Ars ii. 731 f.:

cum mora non tutast, totis incumbere remis
utile et admissō subdere calcar equo;

Met. vii. 569, "nec sitis est extincta priusquam vita bibendo."

(d) Clause of proviso.--Epist. xvi. 15, "rustica sim sane,
dum non oblita pudoris."

The verb is implied in a different tense in Epist. viii.
53 f.:

. . . . iuguloque Aegisthus aperto
tecta cruentavit, quae pater ante tuus

(sc. cruentaverat); in a different mood in Met. xi. 560 f.:

. . . . tenet ipse manu, qua sceptrā solebat,
fragmina navigii Ceyx

(sc. tenere); in a different mood and tense in Amor. ii. 14. 20,

". . . . temptasset, quod tu, si tua mater opus" (sc. temptas);

Epist. xiii. 74, "ut rapiat Paridi, quae Paris ipsa sibi" (sc.
rapuit). The common infinitive is situated in the subordinate
clause in Ars ii. 454, ". . . . quo sine non possit vivere, posse
velit."

¹For obicere with the inf. and subj. acc., cf. Cicero Ad
Att. i. 16. 10, "surgit pulchellus puer: obicit mihi me ad Baīas
Fuisse."

II. Noun (or Pronoun)

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

No particular interest attaches to examples such as Met. vii. 121 f.:

galea tum sumit aena
vipereos dentes et aratos spargit in agros;
Met. xii. 114, ". . . . valuit mea dextra valetque"; Epist. iii.
121 f.:

sed tibi pro tutis insignia facta placebant
partaque bellando gloria dulcis erat,
in which nouns or pronouns in various cases, situated in the first member, are AK. In certain instances, although the structure may be no more involved than in the preceding examples, it may be less obvious that an element is AK: close consideration of the passage Amor. iii. 10. 39 f.:

ipse locus nemorum canebat frugibus Idae,
et ferus in silva farra metebat aper

shows that the setting of the second verse also is Cretan Ida, and that either the genitive Idae (cf. Amor. i. 14. 11, "clivosae madidis in vallibus Idae") or the adjective Idaea is suggested as a modifier of silva. A participle or adjective in the second member may "represent" a noun which is expressed in the first member, e.g., Met. iii. 59 f.:

. . . . dextraque molarem
sustulit et magnum magno conamine misit;

the participle may be in anadiplosis, e.g., Met. viii. 649 f.:

. . . . resecat de tergore partem
exiguam sectamque domat ferventibus undis.

The passage Met. ii. 553-56:

Pallas Erichthonium, prolem sine matre creatam,
clauserat Actaeo texta de vimine cista
virginibusque tribus gemino de Cecrope natis
et legem dederat sua ne secreta viderent

presents a highly unusual scheme. The sense: Pallas Erichthonium clauserat illumque virginibus et legem dederat is clear enough.¹ If Ovid could have written Pallas Erichthonium virgini-

¹Korn-Ehwald comment ad loc.: "Der Zusammenhang ist Pallas Erichthonium virginibus dederat et legem usw."

bus et legem dederat or Pallas Erichthonium clauserat virginibus-
que dederat, the structure would not have been worthy of comment.
But Ovid evidently sought to express (a) two verbal ideas which
share the same object and (b) a second object for the second verb
only, and the result was a contamination of the two Latin sen-
tences which I have set down above. Other examples show a struc-
ture which is, at least from a modern point of view, not strictly
in accord with the canons of formal grammar: in Met. ix. 780 f.:

miserere duorum
auxilioque iuva,

the accusative is inferred from the genitive; in Met. ix. 461 f.:

. . . visuraque fratrem
culta venit nimiumque cupit formosa videri,

it is apparent that Byblis wishes to seem exceedingly beautiful
in the eyes of her brother: the dative is inferred from the ac-
cusative. A group of examples involve the verb dare, or a verb
of similar meaning. In these examples, we may find the direct
object expressed, and the indirect object inferred: Met. x. 280 f.:

simulacra suae petit ille puellae
incumbensque toro dedit oscula

(with subject pronoun also AK); Met. x. 248, "sculpsit ebur for-
mamque dedit"; Met. v. 46 f.:

bellica Pallas adest et protegit aegide fratrem
datque animos;

or the dative may be expressed, and the direct object inferred:
Epist. Sapph. 143 f.:

invenio silvam, quae saepe cubilia nobis
praebuit et multa texit opaca coma.

The verb vocare is involved in similar structure: Amor. iii. 7.
11, ". . . et mihi blanditias dixit dominumque vocavit"; Met.
viii. 652-54:

. . . . populisque recentibus urbem
partior et vacuos priscis cultoribus agros
Myrmidonasque voco;

as is ostendere: Met. xiii. 632-34:

hunc Anius
. . . . temploque domoque recepit
urbemque ostendit.

These examples suggest that the direct object and the indirect
object are felt as so closely related that the one can easily
serve for the other.¹ Two elements are AK in Amor. iii. 10. 5 f.:

¹Epist. xvi. 112 f.:
neve mihi quam te dicis amare noce,

te, dea, munificam gentes ubique loquuntur,
nec minus humanis invidet ulla bonis;

dea is implied in the second member with the adjective ulla, and the comparative notion with minus is inferred from te accusative. The precise interpretation of the passage Epist. xv. 357 f.:

nec plus Atrides animi Menelaus habebit
quam Paris aut armis antefendus erit

depends in some degree on comparison with a passage of similar meaning in the same Epistle, vss. 203 f.:

nec, puto, conlatis forma Menelaus et annis
iudice te nobis antefendus erit,

which shows the only other occurrence of the verb antefero in the Ovidian Corpus. If, in the latter passage, the dative conveys the notion of comparison, and the thought is that Menelaus cannot be preferred to Paris, then, in the former passage, we should expect to find the dative case with antefero, but cannot regard armis as such a dative, i.e., we cannot interpret "or is to be preferred to the martial achievements of Paris." At the same time, it does not seem likely that the author of this Epistle here treats antefero on the analogy of malo, when he has used the dative after antefero; moreover, the Thesaurus shows no instances of antefero followed by quam.¹ Hence we should not be justified in citing vss. 357 f. as an instance of antefero with quam. On the AK principle, the phrase quam Paris simply suggests a comparative notion in the other member. By use of the AK figure, an author might avoid inconvenient repetitions without being guilty of a barbarism.

The noun is "represented" by a participle, adjective, or pronoun in a different case in the following instances: Met. xiv. 768 f.:

qualis ubi oppositas nitidissima solis imago
evicit mubes nullaue obstante reluxit

(ablative singular inferred from accusative plural); Met. viii. 816-18:

. . . . et protinus intrat
sacrilegi thalamos altoque sopore solutum
(noctis enim tempus) geminis amplectitur ulnis

(accusative singular inferred from genitive singular); Amor. ii.

sed sine, quam tribuit sortem fortuna tueri
is not a parallel instance, since it does not involve inference of the direct object from the indirect.

¹TLL, II, 149, s.v. antefero.

2. 51 f.:

crede mihi, nulli sunt crimina grata marito,
nec quemquam, quamvis audiat, illa iuvant

(accusative singular inferred from dative singular); Met. xiii.
339 f.:

. . . . et pondere corporis ornum
ingentem fregit suaque induit illa fractae

(dative singular inferred from accusative singular: anadiplosis);
Met. iii. 28 f.:

silva vetus stabat nulla violata securi
et specus in media

(ablative singular inferred from nominative singular: verb also
AK). The noun is inferred twice in Ars iii. 165 f.:

femina procedit densissima crinibus emptis
proque suis alios efficit aere suos.

The adjective "represents" the noun in part of the context only
in Met. xi. 174-76:

nec Delius aures
humanam stolidas patitur retinere figuram,
sed trahit in spatium villisque albertibus inplet
instabilesque imas facit et dat posse moveri,

where the direct object and the indirect object (in the final
member) are inferred from the subject of the infinitive retinere.

(2) Repeated elements

Simple structure involving (a) identical correlatives and
(b) anaphora may be illustrated by citation of (a) Met. iv. 602,
"nunc quoque nec fugiunt hominem nec vulnere laedunt," and (b)
Epist. xix. 225, "sunt et opes nobis, sunt et sine crimine mores."
The adjective "represents" the noun in the following instances:
Met. xiv. 800 f.:

. . . . et strata est tellus Romana Sabinis
corporibus strata estque suis;

Epist. ii. 110, ". . . . munera multa dedi, multa datura fui"; Met.
xiii. 813 f.:

sunt auro similes longis in vitibus uvae,
sunt et purpureae

(adverbial expression also AK); Ars i. 262, ". . . . multa dedit
populo vulnera, multa dabit" (two elements AK); as does the pro-
noun, in a different case, in Met. xii. 618 f.:

haec illi mensura viro respondet, et hac est
par sibi Pelides.

The word pattern of the passage Met. xv. 30 f.:

candidus Oceano nitidum caput abdiderat Sol,
et caput extulerat densissima sidereum Nox

shows parallelism between the two members which would be complete, were it not for the word Oceano in the first member: balance is naturally restored by inferring the separative notion from the locative ablative. Three members appear in Met. xi. 52 f.:

flebile nescio quid queritur lyra, flebile lingua
murmurat exanimis, respondent flebile lyrae.

In Met. iiii. 253-55:

aliis violentior aequo
visa dea est, alii laudant dignamque severa
virginitate vocant

the correlatives are not of identical form, and the objects of the verbs laudant and vocant are inferred from the subject of the preceding verb. A different form of a verb which has been once expressed constitutes the repeated element in Met. xv. 375-77:

semina limus habet virides generantia ranas
et generat truncas pedibus.

(3) Asyndetic structure

Simple instances appear in Met. vii. 716 f.:

faciesque aetasque iubeat
credere adulterium, prohibebant credere mores;

Met. xiv. 833 f.:

. . . . dignissima tanti
ante fuisse viri coniunx, nunc esse Quirini.

The following instance shows structure which closely resembles anaphora,¹ inasmuch as different forms of the interrogative pronoun introduce the members: Met. xiv. 268-70:

[Circe] ipsa, quod hae faciunt, opus exigit, ipsa,
quis usus
quoque sit in folio, quae sit concordia mixtis
novit ,

i.e., quae sit concordia mixtis foliis novit. The reading here followed is that of N: M omits vs. 268, reads quove over quoque after an erasure, and begins a new sentence with the word quove. Magnus and Ehwald retain vs. 268 and read quove: the passage is then strained and harsh, and will mean ". . . . she knows what the use" (of the herbs, mentioned in vs. 267) "is, or in what leaf it is, how the mixed (herbs?) blend." The reading of N yields a clear and logical antithesis between the individual leaf

¹I.e., polyptoton, see, e.g., Quintilian Inst. ix. 3. 37.

and the mixed leaves. The structure in Epist. ix. 114, ". . . tuque feri victor es, illa tui" is of some interest, at least from the modern point of view, since the expression of the verb in the second person and of a predicate nominative of masculine gender suggest the verb in the third person and a predicate nominative of feminine gender, i.e., victrix. In the following instances the verb is AK as well as the noun, and the noun is "represented" by an adjective in the second member: Met. v. 350 f.:

dextra sed Ausonio manus est subiecta Peloro,
laeva, Pachyne, tibi;

Met. xv. 277 f.:

et Mysum capitisque sui ripaeque prioris
paenituisse ferunt, alia nunc ire Caicum.

The AK figure is less obvious in the second example, for alia with the verb ire would normally mean alia via: but, once it has been said that the river Mysus "grew dissatisfied with its former bank," it is inevitable that the expression "by another now goes as Caicus" should be taken to mean "by another bank."¹ The passage Met. x. 493 f.:

sanguis it in sucos, in magnos brachia ramos,
in parvos digiti

shows a slight complexity. Here there are three members: in the first the verb common to all three, in the second, the noun common to the last two members is expressed.

B. Unbalanced Structure

(1) Common element in remote context

The direct object is inferred from a preceding direct object in Met. xiii. 393 f.:

nec valere manus infixum educere telum:
expulit ipse cruor,²

and, after the intrusion of other clauses, in Met. vii. 144-46:

tu quoque victorem complecti, barbara, velles,
sed te, ne faceres, tenuit reverentia famae;
obstitit incepto pudor. at complexa fuisses.

The accusative of the direct object is inferred from preceding direct discourse in Met. vi. 201 f.:

¹See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Zu alia ergänze ripa."

²Cf. Met. x. 302 f.; xi. 113 f., 437 f.; Epist. vi. 55; Ars 11. 255-57 (common element in remote context, scheme reinforced by repetition of an element).

. . . . laurumque capillis
ponite!' depomunt et sacra infecta relinquunt;
from a subordinate clause in the preceding sentence in Epist. vii.
87 f.:

nec mihi mens dubiast, quin te tua numina damnent:
per mare, per terras septima lactat hiemps.

The direct object is readily inferred from the subject of an infinitive in Ars i. 269 f.:

prima tuae menti veniat fiducia, cunctos
posse capi; capies, tu modo tende plagas;

or from the accusative with a preposition in Amor. ii. 2. 21 f.:

ibit ad adfectam, quae non languebit, amicam;
visat, et indicibus aegra sit illa tuis.

The participle or adjective may "represent" the noun, as in Epist.
xvi. 23 f.:

crimen erat nostrum, si delinita fuisset:
cum sim rapta, meum quid nisi nolle fuit?

Met. xi. 608 f.:

lanua nec verso stridores cardine reddit;
nulla domo tota est, custos in limine nullus;

Ars. i. 341 f.:

omnia feminea sunt ista libidine mota;
acrior est nostra plusque furores habet

(ablative of comparison inferred from instrumental ablative).

Met. ix. 316-19:

numine decepto risisse Galanthida fama est;
ridentem prensamque ipsis dea saeva capillis
traxit

(direct object inferred from subject of infinitive: anadiplosis).

The participle "represents" the noun in part of the context only
in Met. ix. 523-25:

scribit damnatque tabellas;
et notat et delet; mutat culpataque probatque
inque vicem sumptas ponit positaeque resunit

(anadiplosis in the final member). The noun may be, grammatically
speaking, "understood" in a different case: Epist. vii. 99 f.:

est mihi marmorea sacratus in aede Sychaeus
(oppositae frondes velleraque alba tegunt)

(direct object inferred from subject¹); Epist. xi. 85, "vagitus
dedit ille miser (sensisse pulares)" (subject of infinitive in-
ferred from subject of finite verb²). In Epist. ix. 11 f.:

¹Cf. Met. ix. 351, 504-6; xi. 359-61; Epist. xii. 199 f.

²Cf. Met. iii. 452 f.; viii. 686-88; Epist. iii. 111-13;
xix. 79 f. See Korn-Ehwald on Met. viii. 114: "Ovid lässt sehr

plus tibi quam Iuno nocuit Venus; illa premendo
sustulit, haec humilis sub pede colla tenet

tibi suggests the direct object with premendo and sustulit, and the possessive adjective tua with colla as well. A participle or adjective may "represent" the noun: Ars ii. 323-25:

nec tibi morosi veniant fastidia morbi,
perque tuas fiant, quae sinet ipsa, manus,
et videat flentem

(direct object inferred from dative); Amor. i. 5. 13, "deripui tunicam: nec multum rara nocebat" (subject inferred from direct object); Met. xiv. 227 f.:

[sc. refert] lucibus isse novem et terram
adspexisse petitam;
proxima post nonam cum sese Aurora moveret

(accusative singular inferred from ablative plural); Met. vi. 442 f.:

vel soror huc veniat! redituram tempore parvo
promittes socero

(accusative subject of infinitive inferred from preceding nominative); Met. viii. 140 f.:

nil agis, o frustra meritum oblite meorum;
insequar invitum

(direct object inferred from unexpressed subject¹); Met. ix. 79-81:

pollicibusque meis pugnabam evellere fauces.
sic quoque devicto restabat tertia tauri
forma

(dative inferred from unexpressed subject); Amor. iii. 11. 37, "nequitiam fugio: fugientem forma reducit" (direct object inferred from unexpressed subject: anadiplosis²). The participle or adjective "represents" the noun in part of the context only: Met. xi. 544-46:

. . . . Ceycis in ore
nulla nisi Alcyone est: et cum desideret unam,
gaudet abesse tamen

(direct object and accusative subject of infinitive inferred from nominative); Met. xi. 686 f.:

häufig das Subjekt in der Konstruktion des acc. c. inf. weg, einerlei, ob es das gleiche wie im regierenden Satz, oder ein anderes ist."

¹Cf. Met. vii. 18 f.; Epist. xv. 152 f. (direct object twice inferred).

²Cf. Met. viii. 389 f. (dative inferred from direct object); Met. ix. 214-18 (direct object inferred from subject); Met. ix. 588 f.; x. 457-59 (direct object inferred from dative).

[sc. Ceyx] naufragus interit, vidi agnovique
manusque
ad discedentem cupiens retinere tetendi

(accusative with ad and direct object of retinere inferred from unexpressed subject); Met. viii. 247-51:

[sc. perdix] primus et ex uno duo ferrea
bracchia nodo
vinxit, ut aequali spatio distantibus illis
altera pars staret, pars altera duceret orbem.
Daedalus invidit sacraque ex arce Minervae
praecipitem misit lapsum mentitus

(dative with invidit, direct object of misit, accusative subject of infinitive with mentitus inferred from subject, ille, vs. 244); Met. ix. 50-54:

ter sine propectu voluit nitentia contra
reicere Alcides a se mea pectora, quarto
executit amplexus adductaque bracchia solvit
impulsumque manu (certum est mihi vera fateri)
protinus avertit tergoque onerosus inhaesit

(the possessive mea suggests the possessive with amplexus, bracchia, and tergo, and the direct object with avertit). The passage Met. viii. 113-117:

nam quo deserta revertar?
in patriam? superata iacet. sed finge manere:
proditiōne mea clausa est mihi. patris ad ora?
quem tibi donavi! cives odere merentem,
finitimi exemplum metuunt

presents a more complicated scheme. Here, the verb revertar is inferred in vs. 115 from vs. 113; the accusative patriam suggests the subject of the finite verbs iacet and clausa est, and of the infinitive manere; the direct object of the verbs odere and metuunt is inferred from the subject of donavi. In Met. xiii. 821, "hoc pecus omne meum est: multae quoque vallibus errant," the gender of the adjective multae makes it certain that pecudes feminine is to be inferred from pecus neuter.

(2) Disparate clauses or phrases

Simple instances are seen in Amor. i. 4. 27, "tange mamu mensam, tangunt quo more precantes," and in Met. x. 351f.:

at tu, dum corpore non es
passa nefas, animo ne concipe,

where the direct objects manifestly apply to both members. The passage Epist. xix. 49 f.:

non sum, qui solem Paridis reprehendere factum,
nec quamquam, qui vir, posset ut esse, fuit

(verb also AK in the first member, in simple scheme) is of inter-

est, since vir has a different meaning as implied in the subordinate clause than as expressed in the principal clause. In Met. xiii. 13 f.:

nec memoranda tamen vobis mea facta, Pelasgi,
esse reor, vidistis enim; sua narret Ulixes

the object of vidistis, mea facta, is inferred from the subject of the infinitive esse; facta alone is suggested in the following sentence. The adjective frequently "represents" the noun, e.g., Met. iv. 51 f.:

. . . . an, quae poma alba ferebat,
ut nunc nigra ferat contactu sanguinis arbor.

The members may be constituted by two nouns which are not in parallel structure, e.g., Met. xiv. 510 f.:

vix equidem has sedes et Iapygis arida Dauni
arva gener teneo

(the speaker possesses the fields of Daunus and is Daunus' son-in-law). The first member may be constituted by a phrase of adjuration, e.g., Amor. iii. 11. 48, ". . . perque tuos oculos, qui rapuere meos";¹ by a participle: Met. xv. 845-48:

. . . . neque in aëra solvi
passa recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris,
dumque tulit, lumen capere atque ignescere sensit
emisitque sinu

(direct object of intulit, tulit, emisit, subjects of infinitives capere and ignescere inferred from subject of infinitive solvi); or by an adjective: Amor. i. 8. 26, "dignus corpore cultus abest." The first member is a parenthesis in Met. i. 687 f.:

quaerit quoque (namque reperta
fistula nuper erat) qua sit ratione reperta;

here the subject of the indirect question is inferred from a clause which has no integral relation to the structure of the sentence.

A noun (or pronoun) may be inferred in a different case from that in which it is expressed. No particular difficulty is presented by such instances as (a) Met. xiii. 71, "en eget auxilio, qui non tulit"; (b) Met. ix. 704-6:

ut dolor increvit seque ipsum pondus in auras
expulit et nata est ignaro femina patre
iussit ali mater puerum mentita;

¹Cf. Met. xiv. 372 f.:

. . . . 'per, o, tua lumina' dixit
'quae mea ceperunt'

or (c) Ars iii. 135 f.:

quod quamque decebit,
elegat ,

where (a) the verb tulit plainly demands an object, (b) the infinitive ali a subject, (c) the verb elegat a subject which is readily supplied by the context. On the other hand, only the thought of a passage can determine whether or not a possessive genitive is suggested by a noun in some other case: in Met. iii. 370 f.:

ergo ubi Narcissum per devia rura vagantem
vidit et incaluit, sequitur vestigia furtim,

it is obvious that the footprints are those of Narcissus, but in Amor. ii. 14. 9 f.:

si mos antiquis placuisset matribus idem,
gens hominum vitio deperitura fuit,

it might seem that vitio could be interpreted absolutely;¹ however, reflection on the thought of the passage will show that the vitium through which the human race would have been lost, had such vitium existed, would have been not so much a fault of the whole race in general, but of the potential mothers, in refusing to bear children. The second verse of the passage Ars ii. 341 f.:

quem taurum metuis, vitulum mulcere solebas;
sub qua nunc recubas arbore, virga fuit

is marked by harshness of structure. The incorporated antecedent readily applies to both the relative and the principal clauses when it bears the same relation to each clause: thus, as regards vs. 341 above, it will be seen that no harshness is involved, if we paraphrase "What bull thou dost fear, as a calf thou wast wont to stroke"; similarly, we might paraphrase Epist. v. 8, "quae venit indigno poena, dolenda venit" with the English sentence "What punishment comes to the undeserving, comes as a matter for grief," where the two clauses share a common subject. On the other hand, if we paraphrase vs. 342 above by the words "Under what tree thou dost now recline, was a shoot," the structure is much more awkward, so awkward as to be incapable of conveying the same significance as does the Latin counterpart: but in Latin, with its wealth of inflections, one inflected form may suggest another.

¹See Paul Brandt, P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum libri tres (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1911), ad loc.: "zu vitio ist aus v. 9 matrum zu ergänzen; doch könnte man es auch absolut erklären: schändlicher Weise."

No particular difficulty attaches to the majority of instances in which the adjective "represents" the implied noun, whether in disparate clauses, e.g., Met. xii. 595 f.:

at quoniam concurrere comminus hosti
non datur, occulta necopinum perde sagitta;

Met. iii. 169 f.:

Ismenis Crocale sparsos per colla capillos
Conligit in nodum, quamvis erat ipsa solutis;

or in disparate phrases, e.g., Met. i. 654 f.:

tu non inventa reperta
luctus eras levior;

Amor. i. 3. 26, ". . . iunctaque semper erunt nomina nostra
tuis." As regards Met. xiv. 322 f.:

licet ipse decorem
adspicias fictaque probes ab imagine veram:¹

verum, if it is read instead of veram, will be interpreted as modifying decorem implied, or as substantival. In any event, this reading largely does away with the antithesis between ficta and a form of the adjective verus, since these attributes will no longer be felt as in sense modifying the same noun. The antithesis will now be felt to lie between imagine and verum (or verum decorem), and the attribute ficta will be purely decorative and superfluous: the passage will mean: "You yourself may behold his beauty and approve the actuality (or, the true beauty) from an artificial representation." The ficta imago in question is the statue of Picus, to which the narrator can point as she speaks.² I suggest that the reading verum is an "improvement" on the part of a scribe who understood the word imago of itself to mean "statue," and who thus failed to understand the antithesis between ficta imagine and veram imaginem, i.e., between "represented form" and "actual form"; cf. Met. iii. 331, ". . . forma prior rediit genetivaeque venit imago," where imago is plainly synonymous with forma. Discrepancy in number between the noun which is expressed and the interrogative pronoun which "represents" it produces slight harshness in Epist. xv. 195 f.:

cum videas cultus nostra de gente virorum,
qualem Dardania credis habere murus?

¹veram M¹ in rasura N Magnus Ehwald Lafaye.

²Met. xiv. 313 f.:

illa mihi niveo factum de marmore signum
ostendit iuvenale, gerens in vertice picum.

But no difficulty attaches to similar instances in which the common element is situated in close proximity to the member in which it is implied, e.g., Met. vi. 316, ". . . a facto propiore priora renarrant." Patterns of greater complexity appear in the following passages: Ars i. 469 f.:

si non accipiet scriptum inlectumque remittet,
lecturam spera

(subject of the infinitive with spera inferred from unexpressed subject of finite verb: direct object AK in first member of protasis); Met. viii. 189-91:

nam ponit in ordine pennas,
a minima coeptas, longa breviorē sequentī,
ut clivo crevisse putes

(accusative plural suggests ablative singular and accusative plural subject of infinitive crevisse); Met. v. 321-24:

emissumque ima de sede Typhoea terrae
callitibus fecisse metum cunctosque dedisse
terga fugae, donec fessos Aegyptia tellus
ceperit et septem discretus in ostia Nilus

(dative plural suggests accusative plural, subject of infinitive dedisse, object of ceperit: ceperit AK in first member of temporal clause). The passage Met. xiv. 808, 810 f.:

tempus adest
praemia (sunt promissa mihi dignoque nepoti)
solvere et ablatum terris inponere caelo

is another instance¹ in which a common element is expressed in a parenthesis, i.e., must be inferred from a clause having no integral relation to the structure of the sentence.

III. Attributive Adjectives, Epithets²

(1) With copulative

There are four fundamental positions for an attributive adjective which is AK: (a) before the first noun of a pair, e.g., Met. xiii. 816 f.:

prunaque; autumnalia corna

(b) after the first noun of a pair, e.g., Met. viii. 77 f.:

¹Cf. Met. i. 687 f., cited on p. 36.

²Examples involving unbalanced structure have not come to my attention.

nec in hoc tamen ignibus ullis
aut gladiis opus est;

(c) before the second noun of a pair, (d) after the second noun of a pair.¹ We have seen that no particular importance need be attached to the position of the common adjective, or to instances in which such an adjective agrees in gender and number with only one of a series of nouns, e.g., Met. xiii. 751, ". . . magna quidem patrisque sui matrisque voluptas"; Met. ix. 382, "care, vale, coniunx, et tu, germana, paterque" (verb also AK, in simple scheme). In Epist. ii. 103 f.:

te iam tenet altera coniunx
forsitan et nobis qui male Favet Amor,

it is less clear that alter is implied with Amor. However, it seems reasonable to follow the lines of Leo's interpretation,² and to argue that a love which is unfavorable to Phyllis and that now holds Demophoon is represented as another love, inasmuch as it involves another wife. If we exclude the possibility that alter is suggested with Amor, then, we must imagine, Phyllis is suggesting that Demophoon never loved her at all: Demophoon is held by another wife, and by Love, a god who is consistently hostile to Phyllis. But this seems a strained interpretation.

(2) Repeated elements

The scheme involves anaphora in Met. viii. 109, ". . . o patriae praelate meae, praelate parenti." In rhetorical style, Scylla addresses Minos as one "preferred to my own dear native land, preferred to my own dear father." The force of the possessive adjective must be felt throughout, or else the full pathos of the sentence will be missed. Three members appear in Amor. iii. 11. 12, ". . . ipse tuus custos, ipse vir, ipse comes." An adjective of opposite meaning is clearly implied in Met. iii. 643 f.:

pro se quisque timet: 'laevam pete' maxima nutu
pars mihi significat, pars, quid velit, aure susurrat;

the antithesis between sign language and vocal expression is accompanied by a parallel antithesis between "largest part" and "smallest part." Structure quite different from the foregoing appears in Met. xv. 270 f.:

¹See Leumann-Hofmann, pp. 637 f.

²Analecta Plautina, I, 46.

hic fontes natura novos emisit, at illic
clausit.

Fontes is clearly implied as the object of clausit, but the adjective novos can hardly apply in the second member. The antithesis between "opening" and "closing" must find a parallel antithesis which is suggested by the adjective novos, i.e., new and old. Similar antitheses are developed in this same passage: between the golden and the iron age (vss. 260 f.), land and sea (vss. 262 f.), plain and valley (vs. 266), marsh and desert (vss. 268 f.). Like the adjective, the appositional noun may suggest a related notion: e.g., in Epist. iii. 135:

sic omnes Peleus pater inpleat annos,
sic eat auspiciis Pyrrhus ad arma tuis,

the almost perfect parallelism shows that filius is to be inferred from pater.

IV. Predicate Adjectives

A. Balanced Structure

Little interest attaches to such examples as Met. iii. 615 f.:

Dictys ait, quo non alius conscendere summas
ocior antennas prensoque rudente relabi

(members joined by the copulative). Repeated elements give prominence to the common element in Ars i. 401 f.:

nec semper credenda Ceres fallacibus arvis,
nec semper viridi concava puppis aquae.

B. Remote Context

Since a predicate adjective which has just been expressed is readily evoked by the copulative verb, no interest attaches to such an instance as Epist. vii. 51 f.:

tu quoque cum ventis utinam mutabilis esses!
et, nisi duritia robora vincis, eris.¹

In Met. x. 26 f.:

vicit Amor! supera deus hic bene notus in ora est;
an sit et hic dubito, sed et hic tamen auguror esse,

¹Cf. Met. vii. 698 f.:

felix dicebar eramque;
non ita dis visum est, aut nunc quoque forsitan
essem.

it is clear enough that notus is implied with sit, but editors have failed to note that, if this is the case, the same notion is implied with esse.¹

V. Prepositions, Relative Pronouns, Conjunctions

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative conjunction

Examples similar to the following are scarcely worth noting: Met. x. 14 f.:

perque leves populos simulacraque functa sepulcro
Persephonen adiit;²

Ars 11. 287, "at quod eris per te facturus et utile credis
. . . ."; Met. v. 20 f.:

nisi si crudelis id ipsum
exigis, ut pereat, luctuque levabere nostro;

¹See Johannes Siebelis, P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses, rev. by Fried. Polle (Vol. I, 15th ed., Vol. II, 12th ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1892, 1888), II, 2: "Zu sit et hic wiederhole notus." Lafaye, Métamorphoses, II, 122 f., translates: "C'est un dieu bien connu dans les régions supérieures; l'est-il de même ici? Je ne sais; pourtant je suppose qu'ici aussi il a sa place." Neither editor understands notum esse in the final member.

²See Karl Friedrich von Nägelsbach, Lateinische Stilistik, ed. by Iwan Müller (9th ed.; Nürnberg, Geiger, 1905), pp. 515-18, for a discussion of "Wunder's canon." In Ciceronian style, Wunder maintained, a preposition is omitted before the second noun in a series if the two are joined by a copulative conj., unless the ideas denoted by the nouns do not belong to a single unit of thought, but are intended to be isolated from each other; on the other hand, the preposition should be repeated after disjunctives and correlatives. Nägelsbach denies the validity of this canon, on the grounds that repetition of the preposition depends largely on a subjective element, i.e., the individual author's feeling for style and rhythm: e.g., Livy 1. 32. 3, "cum in novo tum feroci populo" would, judged by Wunder's canon, be an incorrect expression. Nägelsbach points out certain regular omissions of the preposition: before the relative pronoun when it has already been expressed before the demonstrative, before the relative pronoun when the verb of the principal clause is inferred in the relative clause, and often before words in apposition. The more important part of Nägelsbach's conclusions might be restated in terms of the AK principle: granted that the AK principle consists in expressing once a word which has more than one relation to the thought of the sentence, then even the simplest expressions in which a single preposition stands before two nouns joined by the copulative show AK; and unusual omissions of the preposition are simply bolder uses of the figure which an author makes according to his own tastes.

Met. 1. 508 f.:

. . . . ne prona cadas indignave laedi
crura notent sentes, et sim tibi causa doloris

(three members). Less usual order is seen when the context is interrupted by other elements than those which are subordinate to the common preposition or conjunction, e.g., Ars 1. 480, "per numeros veniunt ista gradusque suos" (verb and subject also AK);

Met. 1. 61 f.:

Eurus ad Auroram Nabataeaeque regna recessit
Persidaeque et radiis iuga subdita matutinis

(verb also AK); Amor. 111. 2. 3, "ut loquerer tecum veni, tecum-que sederem" (verb also AK). The relative pronoun is implied in a different case in Met. x. 23 f.:

causa viae coniunx, in quam calcata venenum
vipera diffudit crescentesque abstulit annos

(dative inferred from accusative).

(2) Repeated elements, asyndeton

The members are severed by correlatives in Met. x. 79-81:

. . . . omnemque refugerat Orpheus
femineam venerem, seu quod male cesserat illi,
sive fidem dederat,

and thus the application of the common element to both members is somewhat obscured. Similar effects are achieved by asyndeton. The preposition is omitted before the negated word in Epist. xvii. 39, "in me, si nescis, Borea, non aequora, saevis." The passage Met. 11. 3 f.:

culius ebur nitidum fastigia summa tegebat,
argenti bifores radiabant lumine valvae

shows so little parallelism between the two members that the relative pronoun might almost be considered as implied in remote context. The conjunction cum is AK in the first of two parallel protases (of a single apodosis) in Amor. i. 4. 15 f.:

cum premet ille torum, vultu comes ipsa modesto
Ibis ut accumbas, clam mihi tange pedem.

B. Disparate Structure

The preposition applies to the comparative phrase in Amor. i. 9. 18, ". . . . in rivale oculos alter, ut hoste, tenet."

VI. Adverbs, Adverbial Phrases, Adverbial Clauses

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative

The adverb is obviously common to both members in, e.g., Amor. iii. 4. 17, "nitimur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata." Elsewhere, only consideration of the sense of the passage shows that the adverb is AK; such is the case in Met. vi. 91, ". . . expertem frustra belli et neutra arma secutum," where it must be understood that Idas was a neutral, as well as a non-combatant, all to no purpose, if the pathos of these descriptive phrases is to be fully appreciated. It is highly probable that the adverbial phrase is AK in Amor. i. 6. 5 f.:

longus amor tales corpus tenuavit in usus
aptaque subducto corpore membra dedit

(i.e., apta in tales usus). If the expression corpus tenuavit is accompanied by the adverbial phrase in tales usus, we may expect this phrase, or its equivalent, to be implied with the parallel expression subducto corpore. But, once such a phrase is implied, the reader will feel that it is organically related to the adjective apta, which requires such a phrase to complete its meaning, in a sense in which subducto corpore does not require anything to complete its meaning. Although Ovid elsewhere uses aptus with the dative case,¹ or with ad and the accusative,² as well as absolutely,³ it is not necessary that we should, grammatically speaking, "understand," e.g., the dative case of the word usus: on the AK principle, a word or phrase is merely suggested, not "supplied" in an exact form. However, in this instance, the phrase in tales usus might serve either member: aptus with in and the accusative is not unknown to the Augustan age, cf. Livy xxxviii. 21. 7, "et erant deprensi genere pugnae in quod minime apti sunt."

(2) Repeated elements

¹E.g., Met. iii. 596, "portus puppibus aptos."

²E.g., Ars iii. 529, "de nobis quem quisque erit aptus ad usum."

³E.g., Ars iii. 470, "accipiat missas apta ministra notas."

The figure is obvious in Met. xiv. 308 f.:

. . . . multaue praesens
tempore tam longo vidi, multa auribus haus;

less obvious in Ars iii. 419 f.:

ad multas lupa tendit oves, praedetur ut unam
et Iovis in multas devolat ales aves.

In the context of the latter passage, Ovid directs the members of his feminine audience to go where there is a crowd, so that they may have a large number of men from whom to make their choice of a single individual: cf. vss. 417 f.:

utilis est vobis, formosae, turba, puellae;
saepe vagos ultra limina ferte pedes,

and vss. 421 f.

se quoque det populo mulier speciosa videndam:
quem trahat, e multis forsitan unus erit.

The contrast between multas and unam, which is expressed in vs. 419, is thus assuredly implied in vs. 420, although multas alone is expressed. A word or phrase of opposite meaning is suggested in the following instances: Amor. iii. 6. 95 f.:

aut lutulentus agis brumali tempore cursus,
aut premis arentem pulverulentus humum;

Met. xv. 192 f.:

ipse dei clipeus, terra cum tollitur ima,
mane rubet, terraque rubet cum conditur ima.

Here, the words mane and brumali tempore are the only elements which do not find parallel elements in the second member: balance is restored by inferring aestate (or the like) in the first example, vesperi in the second. The ablative of instrument suggests an adjective of opposite meaning in Met. i. 244 f.:

dicta Iovi pars voce probant stimulosque frementi
adiciunt, alii partes adsensibus implent

(Iovis also implied with furēti). Ovid pictures the assembly of gods as the counterpart of the Roman Senate, with its patres maiorum et minorum gentium.¹ The distinction between celestial patricians and plebeians is a favorite conceit of Ovid: e.g., he represents Jove as insisting that he is "not a plebeian god."²

¹Cf. the Burmann ed. ad loc.: P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia ex editione Burmanniana (London: Valpy, 1821), II, 898: "[pars] decum scilicet: atque ad Curiam Romanam allusisse videtur poeta; in qua maiorum gentium patres, vel a censoribus in Senatum lecti pedibus ire solebant"

²Cf. Met. i. 595, ". . . nec de plebe deo"; Fasti v. 19 f.:
saepe aliquis solio, quod tu, Saturne, tenebas
ausus de media plebe sedere deus.

In the passage under consideration, we see this distinction maintained: one group of divinities has the privilege of voting by word of mouth, while others can give only silent tokens of assent (verbo assentiri¹). In order to complete the antithesis, tacitis is inferred with adsensibus in the second member. There is a latent antithesis between "birds" and "men" in Met. vi. 717-19:

mox pariter pennae ritu coepere volucrum
cingere utrumque latus, pariter flavescere malae,
ergo ubi concessit tempus puerile iuventae.

Ovid has just said that, in boyhood, Calais and Zetes had no feathers, just as they had no beards: Met. vi. 715 f.:

barbaque dum rutilis aberat subnixa capillis,
implumes Calaisque puer Zetesque fuerunt.

Feathers were a sign of their maturity as birds, just as the beard was a sign of their human maturity. The close association of the adverbial expression ritu volucrum with the principal verb suggests that, like the verb, the adverbial expression has force in both members of the sentence--a manifest impossibility unless we infer hominum or iuvenum from volucrum. The word iuventae in the subsequent context suggests that Ovid understood iuvenum.

(3) Asyndeton

In Met. xiii. 311 f.:

nec vos audistis in illo
crimina, vidistis,

an adverbial phrase appears in asyndetic structure.

B. Unbalanced Structure

The context of Ars ii. 27 f.:

et quoniam in patria fatis agitated iniquis
vivere non potui, da mihi posse mori,

i.e., vs. 26, "accipiat cineres terra paterna meos," shows that the adverbial phrase in patria is implied with mori.

¹See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Partes adsensibus implent entspricht dem offiziellen verbo assentiuntur Sie erfüllen durch stumme Zeichen der Zustimmung ihre Obliegenheit."

EXCURSUS TO CHAPTER I

I have cited¹ as showing AK two verses after which modern editors posit a lacuna, but which I consider intelligible as they stand: Met. vii. 508 f.:

nec dubie vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras
ducite, et omnia, quae rerum status iste mearum.

This is the text (substantially that of M) as accepted by Ehwald; Magnus read dicite (the reading of MN) for ducite, quas for quae. Variations in the manuscript tradition for the latter part of vs. 509 are as follows: et omnia quae rerum status iste mearum M¹, omnis ait M²F vulgate, omnis eat NUF²e vulgate.² I maintain that the first hand of M gave a more satisfactory reading, whether Ovidian or not. To consider first the reading of NUF²e et omnis eat rerum status iste mearum: if this is a complete sentence, it is vague and weak; moreover, it is hardly Latin. Can eat mean discedat, as Crispinus thought,³ without any indication of direction?⁴ Then we may interpret eat as meaning pereat, but we shall

¹See p. 24.

²If, as Magnus thought (p. xiv), M is the most reliable codex, then there is *prima facie* evidence that Ehwald's text at this point is the best representative of the archetypal reading. But if we reject traditional views of the value of M and accept the recent findings of Otis and Bruère, the better text should be that of NUe, i.e., omnis eat: see HST, XLVII (1936), 159, 162 (summary of Otis' dissertation), 215 F. (summary of Bruère's dissertation). The readings here would seem to substantiate the latter view. If, as Magnus thought, MN and eF belong to two entirely different traditions (O and X respectively), how can Ne (and F, substantially) agree in error against M? The readiest explanation of these readings will be that M descended from a "doctored" MS, that NeF represent the archetypal reading, and that M² restored this reading.

³Delphin ed. 1689, l. 2. 257: ". . . immo omnis iste splendor rerum mearum discedat."

⁴Cf. Epist. xiii. 92, "fac meus in ventos hic timor omnis eat," and note that the phrase hic timor omnis corresponds to omnis status iste. The question whether iste here means "this" is not of primary importance for our purposes, but cf. Met. ix. 616 f.:

. . . . nec taedia coepti
ulla mei capiam dum spiritus iste manebit;

find that there is no parallel in extant Latin literature for such a use of the verb eo without indication of direction;¹ or we may suppose that eat means Aegina tecum eat. Either interpretation leads to positing a lacuna. A third possible interpretation is to take eat in the sense "go against the enemy," "go to war," or the like, and, in the light of this interpretation, it is reasonable to infer that a verse is missing which contained a phrase involving in or ad, comparable to that which we see in Epist. iii. 136, "sic eat auspiciis Pyrrhus in arma tuis." Even so, the expression status eat is a curious one. It is as though we said, "Let my position march with you to battle." The reading eat is, then, subject to grave doubt. We may well seek for a more exact interpretation of the phrase rerum status iste mearum, for we must now inquire whether status can be the subject of habet understood, if it can hardly be the subject of eat expressed. The words vires (vs. 508) and robora (vs. 510) in the context suggest that military resources are indicated by the general tenor of the passage. Kingly status would involve command over the man power of the nation: "Superat mihi miles et hosti," says King Aeneas (vs. 510).² In Livy viii. 13. 2, "iam Latio is status erat rerum ut neque bellum neque pacem pati possent: ad bellum opes deerant: pacem ob agri adempti dolorem aspernabantur," the phrase status rerum indicates both material resources and public sentiment, again in a military context.³ In our passage, the phrase rerum

Trist. v. 9. 37 f.:

dumque--quod o breve sit--lumen vitale videbo
serviet officio spiritus iste tuo;

Ex Ponto i. 2. 54, "peior ab admonitu fit status iste boni."

¹ See TLL, V, 2. 636, "de moribundis," s.v. eo.

² Cf. Auctor ad Herennium 16. 23, "bene maiores hoc comparaverunt, ut neminem regem, quem armis cepissent, vita privarent. quid ita? quia, quam nobis fortuna facultatem dedisset, inimicum erat in eorum supplicium consumere, quos eadem fortuna in amplissimo statu conlocarat. quid, quod exercitum contra duxit?"

³ No attempt has been made here to follow the numerous categories provided by Lewis and Short, s.v. status, pp. 1755 f. The context of our passage shows that we need not concern ourselves with status or status rerum in the technical sense of "public order," "form of government," or "constitution," cf. Livy iii. 37. 2 f., "primores patrum odisse decemviros . . . ut taedio praesentium consulibus duo tandem et status pristinus rerum in desiderium veniant"; Justin ix. 5. 1, ". . . Philippus omnium civitatum legatos ad formandum rerum praesentium statum evocari Corinthum iubet." Status rerum is equated with fortuna, in a more intimate and personal sense, in Trist. i. 9. 37 f.:

status iste mearum would seem to comprise whatever circumstances and resources make war feasible. The status of King Aeacus might appropriately be called potentia. Although the collocation status habet is unknown to me, I do find potentia habet, and that in a military context, in Fasti ii. 481-84:

nam pater armipotens postquam nova moenia vidit
multaque Romulea bella peracta manu,
'Iuppiter' inquit 'habet Romana potentia vires;
sanguinis officio non eget illa mei.'

The question remains whether it is possible to understand habet from a preceding relative clause. It is easy enough to understand ducite (or dicite) and, with it, vestra: for a predicate adjective which is inferred in a different gender from that in which it is expressed along with the verb, cf. Ars ii. 373-76.¹ AK of verbs involving oratio obliqua is common enough, although the construction ordinarily involves distribution of infinitives between the two members. In the present instance, the infinitive esse suffers ellipsis. An exact parallel to our passage would contain a verbum sentiendi aut dicendi AK in the first member, with ellipsis of esse and distribution of subject accusatives and predicate adjectives. Beside vires vestras ducite, et omnia, we may set the temporal clause in Met. i. 348 f.:

quem postquam vidit inanem,
et desolatas agere alta silentia terras.

Here there is ellipsis of esse with distribution of subjects of infinitives--or quem may be regarded as a quasi-object of vidit, as vires might be of ducite. If the sentence had read quem postquam vidit inanem et desolatas terras, we should feel no particular boldness; and this is substantially the structure of the sentence vires vestras ducite, et omnia. If our sentence read vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras ducite, et omnia, quae videtis, the structure would still be simple enough. Modern editors imagine that there is difficulty in understanding the verb of the first relative clause in the second, although parallelism between two relative clauses is admittedly a strong argument in favor of

is status, haec rerum nunc est fortuna mearum,
debeat ut lacrimis nullus adesse modus
(note AK of the phrase rerum mearum).

¹sed neque fulvus aper media tam saevus in irast
.
nec lea

the reading of M.¹ But an argument in favor of the completeness of this reading as it stands could also be based on parallelism. In alternative conditions, we note that the feeling for parallelism sometimes excuses the repetition of the verb in a parallel protasis, e.g., Met. viii. 204 f.:

. . . . ne, si demissior ibis
unda gravet pennas, si celsior, ignis adurat.

No one would demand that the verb ibis be repeated. Admittedly, parallelism between the adjectives demissior and celsior lessens the need for repetition of the verb. On the other hand, there is in our passage a kind of parallelism between haec and iste. No other Ovidian passage in which the verb is understood in the second of two parallel relative clauses is known to me: if such a passage existed, I see no reason why editors should have been in doubt regarding the passage under consideration. However, on the basis of other Ovidian passages to which I have referred, I do not find it too difficult to understand Met. vii. 509 f. as follows: nec dubie vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras ducite, et omnia [sc. vestra ducite] quae rerum status iste mearum [sc. habet]. I venture further to assert that to express the words vestra ducite and habet in the second member, rather than to understand them on the AK principle, would be repetitious. Is it not possible that some copyist, without great feeling for Latin phraseology and unfamiliar with the AK structure, imagined that it was impossible to understand vestras ducite and habet in the second member, and that he chose to make a complete sentence, as he thought, by altering omnia quae to omnis eat? (Ait, the reading of F, appears to be a miscopying of eat, not eat of ait, for, after dixit in vs. 507, ait is wholly out of place, and is thus farthest removed from the right reading: we can hardly suppose that the archetype read ait.) If we cannot answer this question

¹See Korn-Ehwald, I, 380: "Der augenscheinliche Parallelismus von quas haec habet insula mit quae rerum status iste mearum spricht dafür, dass in M das Richtige erhalten ist; wahrscheinlich ist, wie A. Riese schon annahm, der das regierende Verbum enthaltende Vers ausgefallen, wenn man nicht, was allerdings hart wäre, aus dem parallelen Gliede habet ergänzen will." I should not deny a certain degree of zeugma in using the verb habet with a concrete and an abstract subject, i.e., with insula and status; and yet iste with status would seem to indicate things not altogether invisible and abstract.

in the affirmative, we must suppose that the scribe of M emended to give a better reading than did his archetype, and that he made dexterous use of the AK figure in so doing. Whether this alternative view is tenable, it is not within my province to discuss.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMON ELEMENT EXPRESSED IN THE SECOND MEMBER

I. Verbs

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

The simplest structure is exemplified in Met. iv. 669, ". . . Aethiopum populos Cepheiaque conspicit arva"; Ars ii. 262, "parva, sed e parvis callidus apta dato"; Met. vii. 42, "si facere hoc aliamve potest praeponere nobis" More than one element is AK in Met. ix. 624 f.:

vel certe non hoc, qui plurimus urget et urit
pectora nostra, deo, sed victa libidine credar,

and in Ars iii. 407 f.:

sanctaque maiestas et erat venerabile nomen
vatibus;

modern interest may be aroused by the position of the words victa and erat, at the beginning of the second member.¹ Grammatical discrepancies are observable in Amor. iii. 7. 33 f.:

illicibus glandes cantataque vitibus uva
decidit,

i.e., grammatically speaking, the common verb is inferred in a different member, the common participle² in a different gender. In regard to Ars ii. 281 f.:

sunt tamen et doctae, rarissima turba, puellae:
altera non doctae turba, sed esse volunt,

it might be held that sunt is to be inferred in the first member of the second verse either from preceding or subsequent context.

A number of instances show a verb (or verb and other elements) AK in the last of three members, e.g., Epist. v. 35 f.:

¹See Introduction, pp. 4-6, 18.

²The context shows that both members describe the effect of magic spells: cf. vss. 31 f.:

carmine laesa Ceres sterilem vanescit in herbam,
deficiunt laesi carmine fontis aquae.

qua Venus et Iuno sumptisque decentior armis
venit in arbitrium nuda Minerva tuum:

reference is made to the Judgment of Paris: the adjective nuda, as well as the other elements, is manifestly AK.

Two instances which show schemes of greater complexity may be noted here: Amor. iii. 6. 103 f.:

nescio quem hunc spectans Acheloon et Inachon amnem
et potui nomen, Nile, referre tuum

(principal verb and infinitive AK: amnem, common to Acheloon and Inachon, inferred with nescio quem hunc); Amor. ii. 5. 45 f.:

sicut erant (et erant) culti, laniare capillos
et fuit in teneras impetus ire genas

(culti inferred in parenthesis, subject of the preceding subordinate clause inferred from the accusative capillos: fuit impetus AK).

The common verb may be expressed in the second of three members.¹ Balanced structure in which the members are joined by copulatives or severed by disjunctives is seen in the following representative instances: Epist. xii. 181, "dum ferrum flammae-
que aderunt sucusque veneni";² Ars ii. 619 f.:

et si non tenebras, at quiddam nubis opacae
quaerimus atque aliquid luce patente minus;

Amor. i. 15. 21 f.:

Varronem primamque ratem quae nesciet aetas,
aureaque Aesonio terga petita duci?

(subject and verb AK³).

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--The following instances will serve to illustrate the structure: Epist. xiv. 41, "aut sic aut etiam tremui magis"; Ars iii. 73, "et mens et redit verus in ora color"⁴

¹Such a position of the common element will manifestly produce the effect of AK of an element in the second member as regards the first member, of AK of an element in the first member as regards the third.

²Cf. Met. ii. 371 f.; iii. 300 f.; ix. 601 f.; x. 540 f.; xiii. 857 f.; xv. 713-18; Epist. xx. 163 f.

³Cf. Met. ix. 773 f.

⁴verus is probably not AK here, since this adjective is not used in the phrases mens redit, abit, and the like: cf. Amor. iii. 14. 37, "mens abit et morior"; Met. vi. 531, "ubi mens redit" (cf. also Met. ix. 583; xiii. 957 f.; xiv. 519). The adjective verus is used in the context of return to normal exter-

(verb alone AK); Epist. xix. 185, "sed neque conpedibus nec me conpesce catenis" (verb and direct object AK); Met. ii. 293, "quodsi nec fratris nec te mea gratia tangit" (verb, subject, direct object AK: genitive in the first member, like adjective, "represents" the subject); Epist. xv. 55 f.:

qui nec ovis placidae nec amantis saxa capellae
nec patulo tardae carpitur ore bovis

(three members: verb and instrumental ablative AK¹).

The members are distinguished by non-identical correlatives in, e.g., Met. iii. 205, "pudor hoc, timor inpedit illud," Epist. xix. 160, "ille homines, haec est testificata deam" (participle appropriate in gender to but one member). A highly unusual instance appears in Met. vi. 296, ". . . latet haec, illam trepidare videres." This verse alludes to (but does not actually describe) the slaying of the fifth and sixth of Niobe's daughters: the first fell over the body of a brother,² the second perished in the act of comforting her mother,³ the third in a vain attempt at flight,⁴ the fourth fell over the body of the third.⁵ Vs. 297 begins with the words: "sexque datis leto" Thus Ovid employs variety (a) in the account of the first four deaths, (b) in the contrast between actual description in the case of the first four and allusiveness in the case of the fifth and sixth, (c) in the antithesis between latet and videres in the case of the fifth and sixth. Editors have uniformly interpreted this antithesis as did Crispinus in the Delphin edition of 1689: "Haec

nals, cf. Met. iv. 231, "in veram rediit faciem solitumque nitorem." The combination of mens and color, without the adjective, is seen in Met. iii. 99 f., "ille diu pavidus pariter cum mente colorem / perdidit"

¹It is very doubtful whether the adjective patulo is inferred with ore in the first two members. I find no instances in which sheep or goats are described as having os patulum.

²Vs. 291, ". . . inposito fratri moribunda relanguit ore"

³Vss. 292 f.:

altera solari miseram conata parentem
conticuit subito duplicatoque vulnere caeco est

(miserum Ehwald).

⁴Vss. 295 f.:

haec frustra fugiens collabitur, illa sorori
inmoritur.

⁵Ibid.

sese occultat, cerneret illam tremere."¹ In this interpretation, the action of the fifth daughter resembles that of the third: both are vain attempts to avoid the fatal arrows. To a certain degree, then, this interpretation minimizes the principle of variety which Ovid manifestly employs throughout the passage. But a much graver objection may be made: the traditional view does not really explain the antithesis in vs. 296. If latet haec means "one hides" then the antithesis ought to mean "the other shows herself," "is visible." We should have just such an antithesis if the infinitive trepidare were omitted. Trepidare simply does not fit the antithesis: there is no ground for logical contrast between "one hides" and "you could see the other alarmed." Ovid is laying stress on the visibility of the alarm in the case of the sixth daughter: is it not extremely likely that latet, as contrasted with videres, indicates that the alarm of the fifth daughter was invisible, i.e., concealed? If that is the case, then the notion which is expressed in trepidare applies to the first member as well as to the second member, although we could not possibly have an infinitive in the first member. The verb latet suggests that Ovid had in mind the Greek λανθάνει, so frequently accompanied by the participle,² as is δηλοῖ, of opposite meaning,³ and that he was thinking of a Greek sentence of the following tenor: ἡ μὲν λανθάνει, ἡ δὲ δηλοῖ τρέμουσα. The antithesis in the Greek is perfectly clear; but, obviously, it would be difficult to render such a sentence in Latin. If I am correct in my analysis, Ovid still feels the Greek participle when he writes latet, although a similar use of the participle in Latin would hardly do, and we cannot say that trepidare suggests trepidans. The example goes far beyond the bounds of formal grammar in the direction of stimulus and suggestion. The reader accustomed to a style of this nature would not, in such an instance, find it nec-

¹Cf. the translations of Frank Justus Miller (in "The Loeb Library"): ". . . one hid, and one stood trembling in full view"; of Lafaye: ". . . une autre se cache: on en voit une autre s'agiter toute tremblante"; and the note in Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "trepidare] zitternd sich hierhin und dorthin bewegen."

²E.g., Iliad xiii. 721: . . . οἱ δ' ἐπιθεν βάλλοντες ἐλάνθανον.

³E.g., Sophocles Antigone 20: δηλοῖς γάρ τι καλχαίνουσι ἔπος; cf. δῆλός ἐστι, e.g., Sophocles Philoctetes 1011: . . . δῆλος δὲ καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ἀλγεῖνός φέρων

essary to "supply" anything, grammatically speaking, in the first member of this example, but would none the less see the logical application of the common element to the first member.

The verb is AK in the second of three members in, e.g., Epist. vii. 11 f.:

nec nova Carthago, nec te crescentia tangunt
moenia nec sceptro tradita summa tuo?¹

(with AK of the direct object also).

(b) Anaphora.--A simple form of the scheme, in which the members are very brief, appears in e.g., Met. ii. 290 f.:

. . . . quid undae,
quid meruit frater?

the obvious grammatical discrepancy is of no great interest. The following instances are noteworthy for symmetry of members which are of unusually large scope: Met. v. 605 f.:

ut fugere accipitrem penna trepidante columbae,
ut solet accipiter trepidas urgere columbas;

Met. viii. 714 f.:

. . . . frondere Philemona Baucis,
Baucida conspexit senior frondere Philemon;

Met. xiv. 125 f.:

. . . . quae me loca mortis adire,
quae loca me visae voluisti evadere mortis.

In the latter instances, balance is varied by a change in the word order, particularly by chiasmic arrangement of the repeated elements. Similar chiasmus accompanies less complete balance in Epist. v. 15, "se tibi pax terrae, tibi se tuta aequora debent." The common verb suggests a word of related meaning in Epist. xviii. 13, "nunc volucrem laqueo, nunc piscem ducitis hamo" (i.e., volucrem capitis, captatis). Unless this verse means: "Now you draw the fowl from the net, now the fish from the hook," the verb ducitis is not appropriate to both objects. But apparently the ablatives are instrumental, as, e.g., Palmer understands them,² not separative. Duco is used elsewhere in the context of fishing, e.g., in Met. iii. 587, ". . . . calamo salientes ducere pisces" (where we note the instrumental ablative); but the earliest instance known to me of duco in the context of snaring an animal is in Silius Italicus vi. 329-31, "pastor / in foveam . . . / ducit

¹Cf. Met. ii. 615 f.; iii. 408-10 (bis); iv. 400 f.; viii. 111-13.

²Palmer, Heroides, p. 468: "Laqueo, 'with the springe.'"

nocte lupos positae balatibus agnae,"¹ where duco means not so much "catch" as "entice" (by the bleating of the lamb which is used as bait). Thus a more general notion, such as would be conveyed by capio or capto (words which apply to the catching of both fish and game²), is inferred from a word which properly expresses only the particular notion of "catching fish."

The following instances illustrate AK of more than one element: Epist. ii. 88, "iam mihi, iam dicar consuluisse meis"; Met. vii. 255, "hinc procul Aesoniden, procul hinc iubet ire ministros" (with chiasmus); Met. xii. 36, ". . . et pariter Phoebe, pariter maris ira recessit" (genitive, like adjective, "represents" the noun which is AK); Epist. xvi. 81 f.:

a! quotiens digitis, quotiens ego tecta notavi
signa supercilio paene loquente dari.

The structure involves three members in, e.g., Met. xiii. 964 f.:

quid tamen haec species, quid dis placuisse marinis,
quid iuvat esse deum;³

Epist. ix. 25 f.:

quem non mille ferae, quem non Stheneleius hostis,
non potuit Iuno vincere, vincit Amor

(two elements AK). Anaphora is partial in Amor. ii. 12. 7 f.:

non humiles muri, non parvis oppida fossis
cincta, sed est ductu capta puella meo,

where, grammatically speaking, the auxiliary verb is inferred in a different number, the participle in two different genders.

The verb is AK in the second of three members in Met. ii. 298, "si freta, si terrae pereunt, si regia caeli . . ."⁴ in similar position, with partial anaphora, in Epist. Sapph. 129 f.:
oscula cognosco, quae tu committere linguae
aptaque consueras accipere, apta dare.⁵

¹See TLL, V, 2144.

²Cf. Ars i. 763, "hic iaculo pisces, illic capiuntur ab hamis"; Caesar De bello Gallico vi. 28. 3, "hos studiose foveis captos interficiunt"; Ars ii. 77, ". . . tremula dum captat harundine pisces"; Propertius ii. 19. 19, "incipiam captare feras"; Horace Epod. ii. 35 f.:

advenam laqueo gruem
iucunda captat praemia.

³Cf. Met. i. 480; viii. 830 f.; xiv. 504; Amor. i. 8. 7 f.; ii. 10. 13 f.

⁴Cf. Met. iii. 534 f.; vii. 43 f.

⁵Cf. Met. v. 369 f.; vii. 230 f.; xiv. 329-31; Epist. vii. 37-39; Met. i. 54-56 (two elements AK).

The passage Amor. 1. 7. 19 f.:

quis mihi non demens, quis non mihi 'barbare' dixit?
ipse nihil

shows AK of the verb in the second member as regards the first member, in remote context as regards the final member.

(3) Asyndetic structure

The effect resembles that of both anaphora and asyndeton when the members are introduced by closely related forms, as in Met. v. 572 f.:

exigit alma Ceres, nata secura recepta,
quae tibi causa fugae, cur sis, Arethusa, sacer fons¹

(the verb is, grammatically speaking, inferred in a different person), or where an element is negated in the first member, repeated and affirmed in the second: Epist. xvii. 178, "et res non semper, spes mihi semper adest" (two elements AK).

Antithesis and the appearance of two new elements in the second member coincide in, e.g., Ars ii. 305, "bracchia saltantis, vocem mirere canentis."² Zeugma is combined with AK in Met. xiii. 632 f.:

hunc Anius, quo rege homines, antistite Phoebus
rite colebatur, temploque domoque receptit:

i.e., the verb colo is used in the senses (a) "care for" as worshipper, (b) "care for" as protector and monarch.³ Since colo can convey both these notions, it is unnecessary to suppose that the notion "were ruled" is suggested by the opposite notion "was worshipped."⁴ The verb is inferred in a different person in Met. xiii. 130, ". . . tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur, Achille" (vocative also AK); Met. ii. 738 f.:

tres habuit thalamos, quorum tu, Pandrose, dextrum,
Aglauros laevum, medium possederat Herse

¹Cf. Met. xii. 146 f.:

hic labor, haec requiem multorum pugna dierum
adtulit.

²Cf. Amor. iii. 2. 54; 7. 25 f.; Ars 1. 333; ii. 471; iii. 502; Epist. iii. 93; xvii. 125 f.

³See TLL, III, 1676. 11-13 (where reference is made to Met. xiii. 632 f.) and cf. Horace Epist. ii. 1. 7 f., "Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux / . . . terras hominumque colunt genus." Met. xiii. 632 f. is cited in TLL, III, 1670. 52 f. as an instance in which colere bears two meanings.

⁴But see Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Der als König die Menschen regierte, als Priester den Phöbus in hergebrachter Weise verehrte."

(three members); in a different tense in Met. xiii. 137 f.:

. . . . meaque haec facundia, siqua est,
quae nunc pro domino, pro vobis saepe locuta est

(i.e., nunc loquitur). A verb is possibly AK in the fourth of five members in Met. v. 329-31:

Delius in corvo est, proles Semeleia capro,
fele soror Phoebi, nivea Saturnia vacca,
pisce Venu latuit, Cyllenius Ibidis alis,

but it cannot be determined whether latuit is inferred in preceding context, since in and est might well be inferred in subsequent context.

The following passages show a verb AK in the second of two parallel apodoses: Amor. ii. 7. 9 f.:

sive bonus color est, in te quoque frigidus esse,
seu malus, alterius dicor amore mori

(est is inferred in the second protasis, dicor in the first apodosis); Met. xv. 571-73:

'quidquid,' ait 'superi, monstro portenditur isto,
seu laetum est, patriae laetum populoque Quirini,
sive minax, mihi sit!'

(est is inferred in the second protasis, sit in the first apodosis: laetum is common to two datives, minax common to the second protasis and apodosis); Epist. xvii. 119 f.:

siqua fides vero est, veniens hinc esse natator,
cum redeo, videor naufragus esse mihi

(the participle veniens is in parallel structure with the temporal clause cum redeo; the verb videor is thus AK in the second of two apodoses).¹ Similar effect is produced by parallel relative and principal clauses in Ars ii. 515, "quod iuvat exiguum, plus est, quod laedat amantes" (est inferred in the first principal clause, amantes in the first relative clause).

B. Unbalanced Structure²

The common verb is inferred in a relative clause: Ars iii. 655, "quod sapiens, faciet stultus quoque"; Met. viii. 280, ". . . quaeque inhonoratae, non et dicemur inultae"; Epist. vii. 43, "quod tibi malueram, sine me debere procellis"; Amor. iii. 8.

¹Cited by Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 35. Cf. Ars iii. 99 f.:
sed me flaminibus venti maioris iturum,
dum sumus in portu, provehat aura levis,
where iturum constitutes the first apodosis.

²All the examples here cited involve disparate clauses.

6, "quo licuit libris, non licet ire mihi" (with repeated element); Amor. ii. 12. 27 f.:

me quoque, qui multos, sed me sine caede Cupido
iussit militiae signa movere suae

(several elements AK); in a clause of comparison: Met. xi. 730 f.:

quae pater haud aliter quam cautes murmura ponti
accipit;

in an adversative clause: Epist. xiii. 19, "ut te non poteram, poteram tua tela videre" (with repeated element). In Epist. Sapph. 191 f.:

at quanto melius iungi mea pectora tecum
quam poterant saxis praecipitanda dari,

the common verb is inferred in the principal clause from the clause of comparison.

Grammatical discrepancies between the verb as expressed and as inferred are observable in numerous instances, e.g., Met. ix. 493, ". . . quae male sum, quos tu, sortita parentes" (feminine participle applies also to masculine subject). The infinitive is inferred from the finite verb: Ars i. 285, "Myrrha patrem, sed non qua filia debet, amavit"; Epist. xvii. 30, ". . . et, quo non possum corpore, mente feror"; Epist. ix. 168, ". . . virque (sed o possis!) et puer Hylle, vale!" (infinitive inferred in parenthetical clause). A less obvious instance of this nature is Met. ix. 115, ". . . 'quandoquidem coepi, superentur flumina' dixit," where it may be thought that coepi is used absolutely. Lafaye translates: "Puisque j'ai commencé, dit-il, je veux encore venir à bout de ce fleuve,"¹ as though the verb coepi referred to the passage of the river Evenus, now in progress. But there is evidence that Hercules has not yet begun to cross when he utters these words: vss. 116 f. read:

nec dubitat, nec qua sit clementissimus amnis,
quaerit et obsequio deferri spernit aquarum.

It seems reasonable to suppose that the words nec dubitat mean that Hercules did not hesitate to leap into the water, and that the subsequent expressions accordingly mean that he did not wait until he could find a place where the water was quiet. The speech is best understood as an allusion to the accomplished conquest of

¹Lafaye, Métamorphoses, II, 96.

Achelous;¹ hence I would translate: "Since I have begun to conquer rivers, rivers shall be conquered." Since the active infinitive and the direct object are inferred from the passive finite verb and its subject, the grammatical discrepancy is greater than is the case in the preceding examples. A finite verb is inferred from the infinitive: Amor. iii. l. 47 f.:

et tamen emerui plus quam tu posse, ferendo
multa supercilio non patienda tuo

(i.e., plus quam tu potes). A finite verb is inferred from a finite verb in a different mood: Epist. xv. 25, "[sc. Venus] perstet et, ut pelagi, sic pectoris adiuvet aestum" (sc. adiuvat: direct object also AK, "represented" by a genitive in the first member); Ars iii. 14. 50, "etsi non causa, iudice vince tuo" (sc. vincis, vincas: tuo also AK); Epist. x. 77, "me quoque, qua fratrem, mactasses, inprobe, clava" (sc. mactaras); in a different person and mood: Met. ii. 141, "[sc. Fortuna] . . . quae iuvat et melius quam tu tibi consulat, opto" (i.e., quam tu . . . consulis: tibi, common to the clause of comparison and the principal clause, suggests te with iuvat). A different tense is inferred: Epist. v. 137 f.:

qui nunc Priamides (absit reverentia vero),
servus eras

(i.e., nunc es); Epist. xi. 62, "illius, de quo mater, et uxor eris" (i.e., mater es); Ars i. 17, "Aeacidæ Chiron, ego sum praeceptor Amoris" (i.e., Chiron fuit praeceptor). In vs. 332 of the passage Met. xiii. 329-33:

dure Philoctete, licet exsecrere meumque
devoveas sine fine caput cupiasque dolenti
me tibi forte dari nostrumque haurire cruorem,
utque tui mihi, sic fiat tibi copia nostri:
te tamen adgrediar ,

fiat and copia are undoubtedly AK. The question remains: shall we understand the first member of this verse as meaning et tu tui facta est copia mihi or et ut tui fiat copia mihi? Is the verb fiat to be inferred in the first member in a different mood and tense, or in the same mood and tense? For the purposes of the present study we shall devote our efforts chiefly to indicating

¹Met. ix. 27-88. See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Da ich einmal mit der Überwindung von Flüssen begonnen habe (mit Beziehung auf den Kampf mit Achelous), so will ich denn auch hier die Fluten überwinden, d.h. durchschwimmen."

why one or the other interpretation is preferable, if not inevitable, without attempting to deal exhaustively with the vexed question of the construction of fiat. The above verses form part of a speech in which Ulysses defends his right to the Arms of Achilles against the claims of Ajax. In one section of his invective, Ajax has condemned Ulysses for the abandonment of Philoctetes, and has depicted Philoctetes as cursing Ulysses.¹ The speech of Ulysses contains a corresponding section, in which Ulysses replies that, while he himself had a part in the desertion of Philoctetes, he alone was not responsible,² and that, regardless of ill wishes and curses, he will go to meet this enemy of his. Accordingly, as regards vs. 332, the context indicates that ut means "as" and compares the past situation, in which Ulysses had Philoctetes at his disposal, with a contingent situation, in which the tables would be turned. The construction of fiat is not clear: we shall indicate the general nature of the problem in a moment. But first we shall take note of an alternative view, that of Ehwald, which was ably impugned by Helm.³ Ehwald held that ut continued the function of licet, and that vs. 332 meant: ". . . and although I would have you at my disposal, you would have me at yours" (i.e., we should be on even terms). Here there is no difficulty regarding the construction of fiat. But, as Helm pointed out, it is hardly possible that ut and sic⁴ could introduce clauses so clearly antithetic without being correlative,⁵

¹Met. xiii. 45-54; cf. in particular vss. 48 f.:
saxa moves gemitu Laertidaeque precaris,
quae meruit, quae, si di sunt, non vana precaris.

²Met. xiii. 313-16:
nec Poeantiaden quod habet Vulcania Lemnos
esse reus merui (factum defendite vestrum!
consensistis enim) nec me suasisse negabo
ut se subtraheret bellique viaeque labori.

³In RhM, Neue Folge, LVI (1901), 357 f.

⁴sic, in Ehwald's view, would mean something like cum ita
res se habeant, Helm observes.

⁵The present instance is included under "disparate clauses" on the grounds that, while the correlatives ut sic involve logical co-ordination, they also involve grammatical subordination, i.e., ut introduced a subordinate clause. In this dissertation, instances in which the members are distinguished by sic ut, tam quam, and the like, will appear under "disparate clauses."

or that licet could be resumed in ut. For the purposes of the present study, it should be sufficient if we indicate, as we have done, that facta est is to be inferred in the first member from fiat, which is expressed in the second member. But some attention, however brief, must be given to the construction of fiat, since Helm's suggestion that fiat is dependent on cupias in parataxis is not very satisfactory.¹ The difficulty, as I see it, is somewhat as follows: while exsecrere, devoveas, and cupias apparently represent a situation which Ulysses takes for granted as fact, fiat represents a situation which has not yet come to pass, namely, the meeting with Philoctetes. Thus there may be some objection to viewing fiat as subordinate to licet, in parallel structure with exsecrere, devoveas, and cupias. Such an objection will be particularly strong on the part of the reader who, perhaps overlooking the essential significance of the subjunctive with licet, translates in the following manner: "Although you execrate me and curse my life and desire that I might by some chance fall into your hands . . . and (although) you would have me at your disposal"; for here the discrepancy between fact and contingency seems intolerable. But the subjunctive after licet cannot primarily indicate fact, but simply consent, or, in instances like the present, indifference;² thus exsecrere does not mean "you do curse me" but "you may curse me (I do not care)." The former difficulties regarding fiat disappear, if the passage means: "Granted: you may execrate me . . . and you may have me at your disposal as I had you at mine: still I will accost you." The verbs in parataxis with licet now plainly have no particular tense coloring, and there is no discrepancy between pres-

¹Helm refers to Madvig's note on Cicero *De finibus* v. 29. 1, ". . . . necesse est, finem quoque omnium hunc esse, ut natura expleatur", as though this passage, and those which Madvig cites ad loc. (*Cicero Academica* ii. 39 and *De natura deorum* iii. 36), were parallel instances to the Ovidian passage. But these Ciceronian passages involve an infinitive and subjunctive (with or without ut) with necesse est. No parallel instances, which would involve mixed structure with cupio or volo, are known to me. While Magnus, like Helm, infers facta est in the first member from fiat, it is plain that he is not wholly in agreement with Helm in the matter of the construction of fiat: see Magnus ad loc. Heinsius rejected vs. 332 as spurious--an easy method of avoiding difficulties.

²See William Gardner Hale and Carl Darling Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903), pp. 284 f.

ent and contingent time. Furthermore, the protasis is brought to a climax, so that there is in fiat a "concessive" feeling which is answered by tamen in the following verse; in Helm's interpretation, the protasis trails off somewhat lamely, since fiat and tamen are wholly unrelated.

II. Nouns (or Pronouns)

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

In a large number of instances, the subject of the sentence is expressed in the second (or final) member, e.g., Epist. xii. 96, "nascitur et gladios scutaque miles habet"; Ars i. 407 f.:

sive erit ornatus, non, ut fuit ante sigillis,
sed regum positas Circus habebit opes;

Met. i. 610 f.:

coniugis adventum praesenserat inque nitentem
Inachidos vultus mutaverat ille iuvencam

(ille must be inferred in the first member, since it marks a change of subject: Juno is the agent in vs. 609, ". . . constitit in terris nebulasque recedere iussit"); Met. vii. 23 f.:

vivat, an ille
occidat, in dis est.

Suspense is naturally heightened when the postponed subject appears in the last of several members, as is the case in Ars ii. 343 f.:

nascitur exiguus, sed opes acquirit eundo,¹
quaue venit, multas accipit amnis aquas;

there is nothing in the preceding context to indicate what is intended as the subject of nascitur, acquirit, and venit; considerable suspense must be felt before this subject is, so to speak, revealed. The suspended subject appears in the second of three members in, e.g., Ars. i. 187 f.:

parvus erat manibusque duos Tirynthius angues
pressit et in cunis iam Iovē dignus erat;²

and is inferred in a preceding subordinate clause, as well as in a preceding independent clause, in Met. ii. 167 f.:

¹Cf. Met. viii. 612-15.

²Cf. Met. vi. 658 f.; xv. 515-17; Ars i. 455; Epist. Sapph. 117-20.

quod simulac sensere, ruunt tritumque relinquunt
quadriugi spatium nec, quo prius, ordine currunt¹

(currunt inferred in preceding subordinate clause). A scheme of similar nature, but more complicated, appears in Met. xv. 165-68:

errat et illinc
huc venit, hinc illuc, et quoslibet occupat artus
spiritus eque feris humana in corpora transit
inque feras noster nec tempore deperit ullo.

This passage forms part of the Sermon of Pythagoras. We may note, in passing, that the verbs venit and transit are each AK in the first member, as regards the context to which each applies. The logical subject throughout is the word spiritus, but, in vss. 167 and the first part of 168, the speaker is not dealing with spiritus in general, but with the spirit of beasts and the spirit of men. Ovid ingeniously substitutes noster for humanus or for ex humanis corporibus, which would give a more obvious counterpart to e feris. A full statement of the transition of spiritus from animals to men and from men to animals would read somewhat as follows: eque feris humana in corpora transit spiritus ferinus, inque feras ex humanis corporibus noster (humanus) spiritus. The striking feature of the passage, then, lies in the fact that the subject has a general meaning in one part of the context, a particular meaning in another. Pythagoras is saying that the πνεῦμα (in the general sense) wanders and comes hither from another place, goes hence to another place, occupies whatsoever body it chooses, that the πνεῦμα of the animal passes into man, that of man into the animal, and, finally that the πνεῦμα (again in a general sense) never perishes.

A noun which is common to two attributes follows the second attribute in Met. iv. 15, ". . . Nycteliusque Eleleusque pater,"² precedes the second in Met. iii. 218, ". . . et niveis Leucon et villis Asbolos atris." A scheme similar to that of the former example appears in Met. vii. 240 f.:

. . . statuitque aras de caespite binas,
dexteriore Hecates, ast laeva parte Iuventae.

Here the singular of an element which is expressed in preceding

¹Cf. Met. xii. 258-62; Met. xiv. 231 f. (accusative subj. of inf.).

²Nyctelius is attributive to, not co-ordinate with pater, cf. Ars i. 567, ". . . Nycteliumque patrem nocturnaque sacra precare." Other examples of this order: Met. v. 306; xii. 190 f.; xv. 701 f.

context (aras) also is inferred in each of two members, where it is "represented" by adnominal genitives: ". . . and he built two altars of sod, on the right side [the altar] of Hecate, on the left [the altar] of Juventa."

The following instances involve AK of more than one element in the second member: of a noun and its attribute, Met. x. 484 f.:

. . . . merui, nec triste recuso
supplicium;

of an infinitive and subject accusative, Epist. xviii. 24, "posse quidem, sed te nolle venire, queror"; of a direct object and principal verbs, Amor. i. 10. 63, "nec dare, sed pretium posci dedignor et odi." Other instances show grammatical discrepancy between the case of the noun as expressed and as inferred, e.g., Met. iv. 608 f.:

Acrisius superest, qui moenibus arceat urbis
Argolicae contraque deum ferat arma

(direct object inferred from object of preposition); Met. i. 490, "Phoebus amat visaeque cupit conubia Daphnes" (direct object visam Daphnen inferred from genitive visae Daphnes: "Phoebus loves Daphne at first sight"); Epist. xvii. 13 f.:

non poteram celare meos, velut ante, parentes,
quemque tegi volumus, non latuisset amor

(object of celare inferred from nominative amor).

We have seen that a noun which is AK in preceding context may be "represented" by an adjective, participle, or the like, in subsequent context; the converse of this structure is seen when an adjective, participle, or the like, which applies only to the first member¹ "represents" a noun which is yet to be expressed, e.g., Met. vi. 189-91:

. . . . donec miserata vagantem
'hospita tu terris erras, ego' dixit 'in undis,'
instabilemque locum Delos dedit;

¹If the participle or adjective applies to but one member, the structure is not distributive, i.e., there is no distribution between two members of elements which apply indifferently to both; contrast Vergil Aen. iv. 6 f.:

postera Phoebea lustrabat lampade terras
umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram

with the examples cited above, in which miserata is tantamount to a circumstantial clause, flentem is closely linked with flentes; thus these participles are peculiarly appropriate to the context in which they stand, in a sense in which postera of the Vergilian passage is not.

Met. xiv. 305 f.:

flentem flentes amplectimur ipsi
haeremusque ducis collo

(direct object inferred with flentem from genitive). In regard to the last instance, it might be observed that the preceding vss. (299-305) deal exclusively with the restoration of Ulysses' sailors to human form, and contain no reference to Ulysses; hence the participle flentem very probably does not, as might be the case elsewhere, designate a person to whom reference is made in preceding context.

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--The following are relatively simple instances involving (1) identical and (2) non-identical correlatives: (1) Met. x. 682 f.:

nec grates inmemor egit
nec mihi tura dedit,

(2) Met. i. 469, "fugat hoc, facit illud amorem." The suspended subject is in the second of three members in Met. viii. 513 f.:

aut dedit aut visus gemitus est ille dedisse
stipes et invitis correptus ab ignibus arsit

(direct object also AK: correlatives in the first two members).

(b) Anaphora.--The following are typical instances in which a single element is AK: Met. ix. 749, "spes est quae capit, spes est quae pascit amorem"; Amor. iii. 14. 29, "da populo, da verba mihi"; Epist. iii. 89, "propter me mota est, propter me desinat ira" (suspended subject). The suspended subject is in the second of four members in Met. viii. 324-27:

hanc pariter vidit, pariter Calydonius heros
optavit remuente deo flammisque latentes
hausit et 'o felix, siquem dignabitur' inquit
'ista virum!'

A pronoun or adnominal genitive "represents" the noun which is AK in the following instances: Met. viii. 632 f.:

illa sunt annis iuncti iuvenalibus, illa
consuere casa;

Met. vii. 705 f.:

pace deae! quod sit roseo spectabilis ore,
quod teneat lucis, teneat confinia noctis

(subject inferred from genitive in preceding sentence); Met. xiii. 572 f.:

illius Troasque suos hostesque Pelasgos,
illius fortuna deos quoque moverat omnes

(verb also AK in second member). Grammatical discrepancy is seen in Met. ii. 683, "dumque amor est curae, dum te tua fistula mulcet" (i.e., est tibi curae). In Met. ii. 283 f.:

tostos en aspice crines,
inque oculos tantum, tantum super ora favillae,

the common verb is expressed in a preceding member, and the genitive favillae is AK in the second member. Structure involving three members, with AK of two elements, appears in Epist. xiv. 102, "dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra viam," and in Met. xi. 65 f.:

nunc praecedentem sequitur, nunc praevious anteit
Eurydicenque suam iam tutus respicit Orpheus.

In the latter instance, the common subject and object of three members is situated in the final member; the object is "represented" by a participle in the first member. Pathos is achieved by expressing the names "Orpheus" and "Eurydice" at just the point where Orpheus looks back at Eurydice, i.e., at the very catastrophe.

(c) Asyndetic structure.--The scheme of the suspended subject appears in Epist. i. 51, "diruta sunt aliis, uni mihi Pergama restant." In two instances, the common noun is, grammatically speaking, inferred in a different case, and is "represented" in the first member by an adjective: Met. xii. 154, "sacra tulere suam, pars est data cetera mensis"¹ (i.e., sacra tulere suam partem); Amor. ii. 8. 11 f.:

Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit,
serva Mycenaeco Phoebas amata duci²

(i.e., Thessalus dux). In the passage Ars ii. 293 f.:

utilitas tua sit, titulus donetur amicae;
perde nihil, partis illa potentis agat,

vs. 293, with its explicit antithesis between tua and amicae, is evidence that a similar antithesis is implicit in vs. 294; hence the emphasis which illa conveys in the second member of vs. 294 is to be felt in the first, as though this member read tu perde

¹Cf. Tristia iii. 6 (7). 37 f.:

quae si non ita sunt, alium, quo longius absim,
quaere: suburbana est hic mihi terra locus

(cited by Korn-Ehwald ad Met. xii. 154): this instance might be thought to show AK of a noun in remote context, but the members are linked by antithesis between alium (locum) and hic locus.

²Cited by Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 18.

nihil.¹ The nominative perhaps suggests the genitive in Met. iv. 59 f.:

notitiam primosque gradus vicinia fecit,
tempore crevit amor; taedae quoque iure coissent

(i.e., primos amoris gradus). Primos gradus might be thought of as designating something quite distinct from love, and the affair of Pyramus and Thisbe might be conceived as developing, in accordance with Ovid's words, from (1) acquaintance to (2) first advances² (3) love, and (4) betrothal; but the sequence of thought will not be very different if we recognize the possibility of differentiating between "the first steps of love" and love itself.

B. Unbalanced Structure

(1) Remote context

The following instances show both repetition of an element and inference of an element from remote preceding context: Met. xiii. 158, "num petit ille tamen? num, si petat, auferat illa? [sc. arma Achillis]" (illa inferred as object of petit and petat); Met. xiii. 669-72:

. . . . tulitque
muneris auctor opem, si miro perdere more
ferre vocatur opem; nec qua ratione figuram
perdiderint potui scire

(i.e., miro figuram perdere more); Ars i. 397, "sed bene celetur: bene si celabitur index . . ." (suspended subject). Similarly, in Met. xiii. 501-3:

at postquam cecidit Paridis Phoebisque sagittis,
nunc certe, dixi, non est metuendus Achilles;
nunc quoque mi metuendus erat,

the subject is inferred in a preceding subordinate clause,³ and in subsequent remote context. The scheme of the suspended subject, without repetition of an element, appears in Amor. i. 14. 29 f.:

non est, qui debeat uri;
erudit admotas ipse capillus acus,

¹See Introduction, pp. 10 f., for Leo's comment on Epist. vi. 135 f., and discussion.

²To interpret gradus as the word is used in Propertius i. 13. 8, "incipis et primo lapsus abire gradu."

³Difficulty of structure is lessened by explicit reference to this subject in vs. 500, ". . . exitium Troiae nostrique orbator, Achilles!" (voc.).

and in Met. xiii. 420 f.:

'Troia, vale! rapimur' clamant: dant oscula terrae
Troades et patriae fumantia tecta relinquunt

(in the second of three members). The passage Met. iv. 336 f.:

'desinis? aut fugio tecumque' ait 'ista relinquo!'
Salmacis extimuit 'loca'que 'haec tibi libera trado
. . . .'

shows in the second of two speeches¹ a direct object which is to be inferred with a pronoun (ista) in the first.

In the following instances, the noun which is AK is "represented" in the first member by an adjective or pronoun in a different case: Amor. iii. 3. 9, "argutos habuit: radiant ut sidus ocelli"; Met. ii. 294 f.:

circumspice utrumque:
fumat uterque polus

(with repeated element in uterque).

In Ars ii. 199 f.:

arguet; arguito; quidquid probat illa, probato;
quod dicet, dicas; quod neget illa, neges,²

the subject (illa) which is inferred in the first protasis is expressed in the second protasis in each of two parallel pairs of protases and apodoses.³ The object (the indefinite pronoun quidquid) which is expressed in the second protasis of vs. 199 is almost certainly to be inferred in the first protasis, if parallelism between the two verses may be admitted as evidence. If the second verse means: "What she says, you must say; what she denies, you must deny," then it is reasonable to suppose that the first verse means: "Whatsoever she censures, you shall censure; whatsoever she approves, you shall approve." If this is the case, arguet is not, strictly speaking, used absolutely.⁴ Furthermore, the passage involves implicit balance between the expressed subject of the verbs which are in the third person and the unexpressed subject of those which are in the second person. Therefore it is

¹Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 37, cites Plautus Miles 614, "(Palaestrio) quid tibi, Pleusicles? (Pleusicles) quodn' vobis placeat, displiceat mihi" as an instance in which a verb is AK in the second member.

²Cited by Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 28, as showing AK of quidquid.

³Possibly illa in vs. 199 applies to the third, as well as to the first protasis.

⁴Vs. 199 is cited as instancing absolute use of arguo, TLL, II, 551.

probable that the emphasis is that which would be conveyed if il-la were balanced by actual expression of the pronoun tu.¹ By use of the AK figure, the poet is enabled to achieve variety of expression and conciseness within the balanced structure.

(2) Disparate clauses or phrases

In Epist. xix. 73, "idem, qui facimus, factam tenuabimus iram," the direct object, expressed in the principal clause, applies also to the preceding relative clause. Similar structure appears in Amor. iii. 5. 19 f.:

visus erat, somno vires adimente ferendi,²
cornigerum terra deposuisse caput

(i.e., caput ferendi); but here the first member is constituted by the ablative absolute. The inferred subject of a principal clause may be expressed in a following subordinate clause (suspended subject): in a temporal clause, e.g., Met. viii. 445 f.:

dona deum templis nato victore ferebat,
cum videt extinctos fratres Althaea referri;³

in a relative clause, Met. ii. 748 f.:

adspicit hunc oculis isdem, quibus abdita nuper
viderat Aglauros flavae secreta Minervae;

in a clause of comparison, Epist. xiii. 113 f.:

tura damus lacrimamque super, qua sparsa relucet,
ut solet adfuso surgere flamma mero

(if this text is correct⁴). The subject of the verb in a subordinate clause is inferred from a parenthesis in Met. vii. 167, "si tamen hoc possunt (quid enim non carmina possunt?)," from another subordinate clause in Met. ix. 589-91:

praetemptanda mihi. ne non sequeretur euntem,
parte aliqua veii, qualis foret aura, notare
debueram;

the same passage shows AK of a pronoun in remote preceding context. In Met. xv. 336 f.:

tempusque fuit, quo navit in undis,
nunc sedet Ortygie,

¹See Introduction, pp. 10 f. for Leo's comment on Epist. vi. 135 f., and discussion; cf. also Ars ii. 293 f., cited on p. 68 of this dissertation.

²ferenti PS, ferendi codd. deteriores, feraci Mueller.

³Cf. Met. x. 277; Ars iii. 505 f.; Epist. xv. 137 f.

⁴qua sparsa relucet Cod. Guelf. 3, Cod. Helmstad., Heinsius; quae sareluet (quis ara relucet?)^P; quae sparsa relucet G.

the subject of a relative clause in a preceding member is inferred from the subject of the following independent clause.¹ The structure of the suspended subject is perhaps not immediately apparent in the condensed language of the simile, Met. xv. 552-55, 560 f., 565 f.:

. . . . et Amazone natus
 haud aliter stupuit, quam cum Tyrrhenus arator
 fatalem glæbam mediis adspexit in arvis
 sponte sua primum nulloque agitante moveri

 utve Palatinis haerentem collibus olim
 cum subito vidit frondescere Romulus hastam

 aut sua fluminea cum vidit Cipus in unda
 cornua ;

but closer consideration of the passage will reveal that the verb stupuit of the independent clause is AK; once we understand quam stupuit, it becomes clear that the thought is: "He was as dazed as was the Tuscan ploughman when he saw , or as was Romulus when he saw , or as was Cipus when he saw" The subject is, grammatically speaking, "transferred" to the temporal clause in every case. The AK figure facilitates such condensation. In the following instance: Met. v. 200-202:

. . . . sed unus
 miles erat Persei, pro quo dum pugnat Aconteus
 Gorgone conspecta saxo concrevit oborto,

the common subject of the relative and of the temporal clause might be regarded as expressed at the end of the former or at the beginning of the latter; and this subject is, logically, in apposition with miles in the preceding independent clause.

The pronoun of one person suggests the emphasis conveyed by that of another² in Epist. xii. 185, "tam tibi sum supplex, quam tu mihi saepe fuisti" (tantamount to ego tibi);³ Epist. xvi. 80, ". . . . quaque bibi, tu quoque parte bibis" (tantamount to ego bibi); Epist. x. 143 f.:

si non ego causa salutis,
 non tamen est cur sis tu mihi causa necis

¹The above citation involves antithesis between tempus fuit and nunc, navit and sedet, hence is to be regarded as a single sentence. The common element is not, therefore, expressed in context remote from that in which it is inferred.

²Cf. Ars ii. 293 f., cited on p. 68 above; Ars ii. 199 f., cited on p. 70 above.

³This example shows logical co-ordination and grammatical subordination; cf. p. 62, n. 5.

(tantamount to ego tibi: sis suggests sum in the protasis). In one instance, the members are constituted by nouns which are not in parallel structure: Amor. i. 8. 79 f.:

et, quasi laesa prior, nonnumquam irascere laeso;
vanescit culpa culpa repensa tua,

where the possessive adjective tua suggests the genitive eius, or the like: the sense is: "Blame which attaches to you vanishes when compensated by blame which attaches to him."

A number of instances involve grammatical discrepancies. The nominative is inferred: from the dative, Epist. xvi. 189, "dum novus est, potius coepto pugnemus amori"; from the accusative, Met. xv. 301-3:

. . . . cum carcere rima
nulla foret toto, nec pervia flatibus esset,
extentam tumefecit humum

(i.e., nec humus pervia flatibus esset: the first statement, to the effect that there was no fissure at all, can hardly be followed by a second which means: "Nor was there a fissure which gave exit to the blasts"¹). The direct object is inferred: from the nominative, Met. ix. 571, "cum daret, elapsae manibus cecidere tabellae"; from the ablative, Epist. xx. 99 f.:

miror et innumeris structam de cornibus aram
et de qua pariens arbore nixa deast

(incorporated antecedent: miror aram et arborem, de qua . . .²). The accusative subject of the infinitive is inferred: from the nominative, Ars ii. 265 f.:

rure suburbano poteris tibi dicere missa,
illa vel in Sacra sint licet empta via;

from the dative, Epist. v. 145, "ipse, ratus dignam, medicas mihi tradidit artes"; a predicate accusative with the infinitive from a predicate nominative, Epist. xix. 216, "quem fore iurasti, sit gener ille mihi." Some doubt attaches to the exact interpretation of the passage Met. vi. 267-70:

fama mali populique dolor lacrimaeque suorum
tam subitae matrem certam fecere ruinae
mirantem potuisse irascentemque quod ausi
hoc essent superi

¹See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.

²Cf. Met. ix. 646 f.:
iam Cragon et Limyren Xanthique reliquerat undas
quoque Chimaera iugo mediis in partibus ignem,
pectus et ora leae, caudam serpentis habebat
(with AK of reliquerat in the third member of the principal clause, of habebat in the final member of the relative clause).

It is impossible to determine with surety whether we are to understand, in vs. 269, "wondering that the gods could do this," thus inferring the subject of potuisse from the subject of ausi essent, and the cognate accusative from the expressed cognate accusative hoc, or whether we are to regard potuisse as without subject, and to interpret "wondering that it was possible." However, the fact that the two participles mirantem and irascentem are in parallel structure and that both indicate Niobe's mental state suggests that, although the constructions dependent on the participles are not grammatically parallel, there is a close interrelation of meaning, and that both dependent constructions have logically the same subject. The genitive is inferred from the accusative, Epist. xix. 45, "ut partem effugias, non omnia retia falles"¹ (i.e., partem retium). The structure in Amor. i. 8. 53, "forma, nisi admittas, nullo exercente senescit," superficially, at least, closely resembles that of the foregoing examples. If we regard AK as a purely grammatical phenomenon, we shall be inclined to infer exercentem as the object of admittas from exercente; but the result will not be good Latin. There can be no doubt, however, that exercente suggests a thought which is needed to complete the subordinate clause nisi admittas. Grammatically speaking, this thought would be expressed in the form a clause qui exercent, or the like.² But it is our contention that in such an instance the Roman hearer or reader actually (i.e., grammatically) "supplied" nothing.

In some instances, an adjective (participle, pronoun, genitive) "represents" the common noun. The common element is inferred in the same case in which it is expressed in, e.g., Epist. vii. 127 f.:

est etiam frater, cuius manus in pia possit
respergi nostro, sparsa cruore viri;³

Met. vii. 485 f.:

neque enim coniunctior ulla
Cecropidis, quam est haec tellus

¹Cited by Leo, Analecta Plautina, I, 18.

²See Brandt, Amores, ad loc.: "zu admittas dürfte iuvenes zu ergänzen sein, qui exercent."

³The participial modifier on which the common element depends, as expressed, constitutes a member which is not in parallel structure with the infinitive: hence the structure is unbalanced.

(with AK of est). Other instances show grammatical discrepancy. Some of these involve phrases which are not in parallel structure, e.g., Met. ii. 826, ". . . et inlaesas vitiatis addere partes"; Epist. i. 28, "illi victa suis Troica fata canunt" (i.e., victa suis fatis);¹ Met. vii. 430 f.:

nullus Erechthidis fertur celebratio illo
inluxisse dies;²

Ars iii. 455, "discite ab alterius vestris timuisse querelis."

In Amor. ii. 6. 11 f.:

omnes, quae liquido librat in aere cursus,
tu tamen ante alios, turtur amice, dole,

the pronoun alios obviously cannot, because of its gender, mean "other birds" (cf. quae in the relative clause), but must mean "other friends." The verb dole is also AK (i.e., grammatically speaking, dolete is inferred with omnes). Some instances involve clauses which are not in parallel structure, e.g., Epist. xiii. 108, "dum careo veris, gaudia falsa iuvant"; Met. xv. 230 f.:

[sc. spectat] . . . illos, qui fuerant solidorum
mole tororum
Herculeis similes, fluidos pendere lacertos

(i.e., Herculeis lacertis similes); Epist. vii. 131 f.:

si tu cultor eras elapsis igne futurus,
paenitet elapsos ignibus esse deos

(i.e., elapsis deis: with repeated element in the participles);

Epist. ii. 59 f.:

quae fuit ante illam, mallet suprema fuisset
nox mihi

(i.e., ante illam noctem). The first member is constituted by an ablative absolute in Met. x. 65 f.:

quam tria qui timidus, medio portante catenas,
colla canis vidit

(i.e., medio collo portante), where difference in number between the noun as expressed and as inferred contributes to the intricacy of the structure.

¹An adjective "represents" the noun: cf. Met. ii. 208; iii. 259 f., 361; iv. 652; vi. 170 f.; ix. 714; Amor. i. 8. 78; ii. 1. 20; ii. 17. 22, "iungitur herous cum breviori modo" (herous S, in versus P); Ars ii. 254; iii. 525 f.; Epist. iii. 121; v. 44; xvi. 218; Epist. Sapph. 37, 131.

²A pronoun "represents" the noun: cf. Met. ix. 737 f.; xv. 253; Epist. xv. 137; xx. 106.

III. Attributive Adjectives (Epithets,
Adjectival Phrases and Clauses):
Predicate Adjectives

A. Balanced Structure¹

(1) With copulative

The following instances will serve to illustrate the two fundamental positions of an adjective (or similar attribute) which is common to two nouns and is expressed with the second: (a) Met. xii. 375, "excipit ille ictus galea clipeoque sonanti"; Epist. vii. 5, ". . . corpusque animamque puicum" (common attribute appropriate in accordance to both nouns); Met. viii. 642, ". . . foliisque et cortice sicco . . ."; Met. viii. 656, ". . . sponda pedibusque salignis"; Met. xii. 458, ". . . ad mentum lingua mentoque ad guttura fixo"; Epist. xv. 87, ". . . donis formaque probata" (common attribute appropriate in accordance only to the second noun²); (b) Met. vi. 454, ". . . si modo des illis cultus similesque paratus"; Met. xiii. 613, ". . . rostrisque et aduncis unguibus";³ Ars ii. 108, ". . . quod tibi non facies solave forma dabit"; Amor. i. 8. 87, "servus et ad partes sollers ancilla parentur"; Met. i. 105, ". . . cornaque et in duris haerentia mora rubetis"⁴ (common attribute appropriate in accordance to both nouns⁵); Met. xi. 131, ". . . ad caelumque manus et splendida brachia tollens . . ." (Midas' hands as well as his arms must surely be gold-bedizened); Met. xv. 783-85:
arma ferunt inter nigras crepitantia nubes
terribilesque tubas auditaque cornua caelo
praemonuisse nefas
(common attribute appropriate in accordance only to the second noun). Other elements interrupt the series in Met. i. 646, "illa

¹No instances involving unbalanced structure have come to my attention.

²Cf. Epist. ii. 50; iii. 85.

³Cf. Met. viii. 147, "rostro . . . adunco."

⁴Horace also alludes to the cornel-cherry as a plant which is to be found among brambles, Horace Epist. i. 16. 8 f.:

quid si rubicunda benigni
cornu vepres et pruna ferant?

⁵Cf. Met. iii. 570; vi. 44 f.; vii. 549; ix. 655; Amor. i. 9. 28.

manus lambit patriisque dat oscula palmis¹; Ars 11. 269 f.:

quin etiam turdoque licet missaque corona
te memorem dominae testificere tuae.

The common adjective follows the third noun in a series of four in Met. xiv. 18 f.:

pudor est promissa precesque
blanditiasque meas contemptaque verba referre.

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--Simple instances of an adjective AK in this structure are seen in Met. viii. 560 f.:

. . . . 'utor'que 'Acheloe, domoque
consilioque tuo' ,

and in Met. 1x. 612, ". . . . nec petit horamque animumque vacan-
tem." The attribute is appropriate in accidence only to the sec-
ond noun in the following examples: Epist. v. 39 f.:

consului (neque enim modice terrebar) anusque
longaeuosque senes;

Met. xi. 637 f.:

adicit et vestes et consuetissima cuique
verba ;

Met. viii. 682, ". . . . concipiunt Baucisque preces timidusque
Philemon" (preces interrupts the series); Amor. 1. 1. 19 f.:

nec mihi materiast numeris levioribus apta
aut puer aut longas compta puella comas.¹

An adjective suggests an attributive notion of opposite meaning in Met. xi. 152, ". . . . Sardibus hinc, illinc parvis finitur
Hypaeis" (with AK of the verb: the epithet magnae is applied to Sardis in this same passage, vs. 137, ". . . . 'vade' ait 'ad
magnis vicinum Sardibus amnem"). A similar inference should perhaps be made in the interpretation of Met. v. 392,
". . . . et aut violas aut candida lilia carpit" This verse occurs in the Proserpine episode, which is traditionally set in flowering meadows.² In the fourth book of the Fasti Ovid treated the myth of Proserpine again, and here his conception of

¹Cf. Horace Epod. xi. 25-28:

unde expedire non amicorum queant
libera consilia nec contumeliae graves,
sed alius ardor aut puellae candidae
aut teretis pueri longam renodantis comam.

²See the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 6-8, where Persephone is depicted as gathering flowers.

the scene manifestly involves a contrast of colors in the flowers which Proserpine gathered: cf. Fasti iv. 430, ". . . pictaque dissimili flore nitebat humus." There is a possibility then, that a contrast of colors is intended in Met. v. 392, and that "white lilies" is meant to suggest "dark violets." However, all varieties of violets do not have the same color, as the Elder Pliny observed.¹ Other passages in which Ovid depicts lilies and violets² or violets and other flowers³ together may show a similar interest in contrast of colors, but Ovid never, to the best of my knowledge, applies a color epithet to viola.⁴ It may be of some interest to observe that Claudian, in his more elaborate version of the myth of Proserpine, also speaks of lilies and violets, and that here the violets are "dark": De raptu Proserpinae ii. 128 f.:

haec lilia fuscis
intexit violis;

but it would be difficult to prove that this is a direct echo of Ovid, or we might certainly infer that Claudian understood the Ovidian passage to mean aut violas fuscas aut candida lilia carpit. As it is, we cannot be certain.

(b) Anaphora.--Structure similar to anaphora appears in Met. iii. 691, ". . . accessi sacris Baccheaque sacra frequento," and in Remedia 747, "cur nemost, Hecalen, nullast, quae ceperit Iron" (adjectival clause AK); partial anaphora in Met. i. 256-58:

esse quoque in fati reminiscitur ad fore tempus,
quo mare, quo tellus correptaque regia caeli
ardeat ,

and in Met. xii. 59-61:

¹Pliny Naturalis historia xxi. 14. 1, "violis honos proximus [post lilia], earumque plura genera: purpureae, luteae, albae"; cf. Vergil Ecl. ii. 47 (pallentes); Catalepton iii. 12 (lutea).

²Cf. Met. x. 190 f.:
". . . siquis violas rigidumve papaver in horto
lilisque infringat fulvis horrentia linguis;
Fasti v. 317, "lilia deciderant, violas arere videres."

³Cf. Fasti v. 272, "ad violam et cytisos et thyma cana voco."

⁴Rubor is closely associated with viola in Met. iv. 268 f.:
est in parte rubor, violaeque similimus ora
flos tegit.
Vergil uses the epithet nigra: Ecl. x. 39, "et nigrae violae sunt et vaccinia nigra." Ovid gives an explicit color contrast involving lilies in Met. iv. 354 f.:

. . . ut eburnea siquis
signa tegat claro vel candida lilia vitro.

illic Credulitas, illic temerarius Error
vanaque Laetitia est consternatique Timores
Seditioque recens dubioque auctore Susurri

(where also the verb is AK in the third of six members). Three members are involved in Met. 1. 559, ". . . te coma, te citharae, te nostrae, laure, pharetrae." All these instances show grammatical discrepancy.

Predicate adjectives are AK in the following instances:

Amor. 1. 13. 21, "nec tu consulto, nec tu iucunda deserto"; Amor. 111. 13. 36, "sint mihi, sint populo semper amica suo" (adverb also AK); Epist. viii. 75 f.:

omnia solliciti plena timoris erant omnia luctus,
(verb also AK); Amor. 11. 3. 13, "est etiam facies, sunt apti lusibus anni" (dative also AK).

(3) Asyndetic structure

The first member is negated, and an element repeated in the second member in Met. xiii. 550, ". . . non oblita animorum, annorum oblita suorum," which forms a relatively simple instance. Not much greater difficulty should attach to the identification of the figure in Amor. 1. 2. 23, "necte comam myrto, maternas iunge columbas," since the myrtle also is sacred to Venus,¹ the mother in question.

IV. Adverbs (or Adverbial Phrases)

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative

The following are relatively simple instances: Amor. 111. 6. 106, ". . . sint rapidi soles siccae semper hiemps"; Met. xi. 71 f.:

quippe pedum digitos, in quantum est quaeque secuta,
traxit et in solidam detrusit acumina terram.²

¹Cf. Amor. 1. 15. 37 f.; 111. 1. 34; Ars 111. 53; Fasti iv. 15.

²See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "zu pedum digitos traxit ist aus dem Folgenden in solidam terram zu ergänzen."

(2) Repeated elements

In the following instances, the AK figure is accompanied by the repetition of an element: Met. xii. 162 f.:

quid enim loqueretur Achilles,
aut quid apud magnum potius loquerentur Achillem?

Ars i. 279 f.:

mollibus in pratis admugit femina tauro,
femina cornipedi semper adhinnit equo.

(3) Asyndetic structure

As regards the interpretation of Amor. iii. 12. 13 f.:

an prosint dubium, nocuerunt carmina semper:
invidiae nostris illa fuere bonis,

it is to be noted that the verbs prosint and nocuerunt in vs. 13 are of opposite meaning, and that both share the same (suspended) subject; hence it is highly probable that the adverb which is expressed in the second member suggests a related adverbial notion which will be appropriate in the first member, i.e., that semper suggests umquam. In other words, if the second part of the antithesis means "Poems have always done harm," the first will mean "Whether they are ever helpful is a matter of doubt."¹

B. Unbalanced Structure

If the text of MN is correct, a negative must be inferred in the first member from nisi in Met. vi. 294, ". . . oraque compressit, nisi postquam spiritus ibat." Other codices have the following readings: oraque non pressit, nisi postquam spiritus exit l (Laurentianus), vulgate; oraque compressit postquam sibi spiritus erat F. Magnus, seemingly in view of the false quantity (erat) in the reading of F, concludes that a prose gloss underlies the verse.² Such a gloss might perhaps have existed in the form of a marginal comment on vss. 292 f.:

altera solari miserum conata parentem
conticuit subito duplicataque vulnere caeco est;

obviously vs. 293 does not carry the narrative (of the slaying of

¹The important feature of this instance is the antithesis in asyndetic structure; hence it is cited here, and not under "unbalanced structure."

²Magnus, p. 216: "Versum e glossa orationis solutae confictum esse docet ipsa lectio codicis F."

Niobe's daughters) forward, but only adds a descriptive touch. Helm defended the reading of MN (although he considered the verse without sense as it stands) on the grounds that a verse containing a negative has been lost from the text between vss. 293 and 294.¹ Helm offered proof that the use of postquam with the imperfect indicative is a feature of poetic style.² The reading of l may possibly be an attempt to improve upon this difficult imperfect, and to supply the missing negative; the reading of F, an "improvement" which rids the text of nisi by the substitution of sibi; and, after a dative, what could be simpler than to substitute erat for ibat? But there is hardly any method of accounting for the present condition of the readings to which grave objections cannot be made. One thing is clear from a comparison of the variants: the words compressit and nisi belong to the archetypal reading. If the reading of F actually reproduced a gloss in the archetype, I can understand how the scribe of l changed erat to exit, but not how the scribes of both l and MN hit upon the expedient of altering sibi to nisi, with the result that, in all but meter, MN achieved a reading more difficult than that of the archetype. Still less can I understand how two copyists would independently have altered non pressit to compressit, if nisi were in the text. I question only Helm's initial assumption, namely, that the reading of MN is without sense as it stands. I offer as corroborative evidence for the genuineness as well as the completeness of this reading a similar (though not strictly parallel) construction attested by the manuscript tradition for Livy xxxiv. 16. l, ". . . . ubi spem nisi in virtute haberent". Crevier long ago recognized the possibility of inferring the negative from nisi in this passage.³ Kroll has warned us against basing grammatical rules on the apparatus criticus;⁴ but, if we

¹Rhm, Neue Folge, LVI (1901), 354.

²Cf., e.g., Met. 1. 113 f., "postquam / sub Iove mundus erat".

³J. B. L. Crevier, T. Livii Libri (Paris: Desaint et Saillant, 1747-48), III, 225: "Vel excidit hoc loco negatio, legendumque non haberent, vel supplenda est ex sensu. Utroque trahunt doctissimi viri, quorum alii existimant nisi interdum sumi pro non nisi; alii negant, et locos omnes, ubi nisi videtur fungi vice duplicis negationis, vitiatos esse putant."

⁴Rhm, Neue Folge, LXIX (1914), 96.

reject universally what seems contrary to the rules of orthodox grammar, are we not sometimes at the mercy of the learned copyist, and must we not set aside the rule of lectio difficilior? Further corroborative evidence for the genuineness of our passage may be found in AK of neque, perhaps as early as Cicero¹ (no Ovidian instances are known to me). Löfstedt, discussing the use in later Latin of nisi for quam following a negative and a comparative, suggests that contamination (or analogy) is a factor in the production of expressions such as nihil (aliud) nisi (i.e., nihil aliud quam);² of particular interest, as concerns our Ovidian passage, are contaminations of nisi and priusquam, which apparently form the basis of such sentences as nemo denique in spectaculo ineundo prius cogitat nisi videri et videre³ or non prius sumebat cibum, nisi primo monumentum intraret.⁴ In our Ovidian passage, several quite normal expressions might have been used; of these, I select two: (a) non prius ora compressit, quam spiritus ibat, (b) ora compressit, (sed tantum) postquam spiritus ibat, since one is the negative, the other the positive way of expressing the same thought. I suggest that the writer's first intention was to express himself in the second fashion; the positive expression in vs. 293 would naturally be continued by a second (formally) positive expression, i.e., the sequence would be conticuit . . . oraque compressit. But I suggest that, at the same time, the writer sought to achieve something of the emphasis which non prius . . . quam would have afforded, while still retaining the (formally) positive expression in the first member. Non . . . prius suggests both nisi and postquam; these words are accordingly used to introduce the second member, with somewhat the following effect: "And she closed her lips . . . but only now that the breath was departing."⁵ Similarly, we might render the Livian passage: ". . . where they would have hope only in hardihood" Unfortunately, my translations ren-

¹Cf. Cicero Ad fam. viii. 13. 2: the MS tradition supports the reading. . . . qui exercitum neque provincias traderet.

²Einar Löfstedt, Vermischte Studien (Lund, 1936), pp. 36 f.

³Tertullian De spectaculis 25.

⁴Historia Apollonii 30.

⁵The present study does not attempt to deal with the problem of the imperfect tense in this sentence.

der a highly unusual Latin construction by a normal English idiom, equivalent to Latin sed tantum; but I note that, in my English rendering, the adverb only lends its color to both members of the sentence, as would tantum in Latin. To understand the negative from nisi is only one step further removed.

V. Prepositions

AK of a preposition in the second member is naturally quite rare. I have found the following Ovidian instances: Met. xii. 124, "inde velut muro solidaque a caute repulsa est; Epist. xvii. 157 f.:

. . . . Colchos et in ultima Ponti
quaque viam fecit Thessala pinus, eam

(with copulative conjunction); Met. xiv. 176, ". . . aut tumulto aut certe non illa condar in alvo" (with correlatives: preposition and verb both AK in the second member); Ars ii. 519, "litore quot conchae, tot sunt in amore dolores" (in unbalanced structure:¹ preposition and verb both AK in the second member). There are a few other instances, but these involve the distributive structure.

¹Or with non-identical correlatives: see p. 62, n. 5.

CHAPTER III

THE COMMON ELEMENTS DISTRIBUTED

I. Substantives¹

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

The following instances will serve to illustrate the distribution of a noun and its attribute between two members: Ars iii. 607, "callida prosiliat dicatque ancilla 'perimus!'" Ars 1. 238, "cura fugit multo diluiturque mero."² This scheme is accompanied by AK of other elements: of a noun, e.g., Met. xi. 606 f.:

[sc. herbae] quarum de lacte soporem
nox legit et spargit per opacas umida terras

(direct object AK in the first member); Met. xiii. 425 f.:

tamen unius hausit
inque sinu cineres secum tulit Hectoris haustos

(direct object AK in the second member; with anadiplosis);³ of a verb, e.g., Met. vi. 164, ". . . turaque dant sanctis et verba precantia flammis" (verb AK in the first member);⁴ Epist. Sapph. 79, "molle meum levibusque cor est violabile telis" (verb AK in the second member);⁵ of a verb and noun, e.g., Epist. viii. 52, "non lectast operi, sed data causa tuo" (sum auxiliary and subject distributed: the scheme reinforced by antithesis of lec-

¹Under this heading we shall include instances whose principal feature is the distribution of a noun and its attribute (attributive adjective, genitive, and the like), of a noun and predicate adjective, noun and adverb, two nouns, or two adjectives: the two distributed elements, and sometimes other elements, are AK.

²Cf. Met. xiii. 27 f., 731, 766 f.; xiv. 544 f., 781 f.; xv. 515-17; Amor. i. 4. 18; i. 11. 1; i. 14. 53; Epist. xi. 39 f.

³Cf. similar schemes in Met. xiii. 27 f.; Ars iii. 300; Epist. Sapph. 216.

⁴Cf. Met. vi. 686; ix. 159; x. 551; xiii. 3 f.; xv. 315 f.; Amor. ii. 19. 44; Ars i. 712; ii. 617.

⁵Cf. Met. viii. 843 f.

ta and data); Met. iv. 620, "unde frequens illa est infestaque terra colubris";¹ of a verb and participle: Amor. i. 4. 11 f.:

quae tibi sint facienda tamen, cognosce, nec Euris
da mea nec tepidis verba ferenda notis;²

Met. xv. 792 f.:

. . . . cantusque feruntur
auditi sanctis et verba minantia lucis;³

Met. ix. 99 f.:

capitis quoque fronde saligna
aut superinposita celatur harundine damnum.⁴

The distributed common elements consist of an object and a sub-

¹Cf. Epist. xvi. 156, "magna fuit subitae iustae causa viae"; Met. xii. 496 f.:

. . . . manet inperfossus ab omni
inque cruentatus Caeneus Elateius ictu;

Met. v. 276 f.:

Daulida Threicio Phoeaque milite rura
ceperat ille ferox

²The reference in TLL, V, 1079. 6, s.v. Euris: "nomen venti (fere noxii, frigidi)" would lead us to suppose that we might infer the epithet frigidis with Euris in this passage, and the following passages, in particular, seem to bear out this supposition: Juvenal xiv. 185-87:

. . . . quem non pudet alto
per glaciem perone tegi, qui summovet euros
pellibus inversis;

Vergil Geo. ii. 339, ". . . . hibernis parcebant flatibus Euri
. . . ."; Propertius ii. 26b. 35 f.:

saevus licet urgeat eurus
velaque in incertum frigidus auster eat.

In Ovid Epist. vii. 41 f.:

quo fugis? obstat hiemps. hiemis mihi gratia prosit!
adspice ut eversas concitet Eurus aquas,

Eurus is associated with hiemps, but hiemps is simply stormy weather, not necessarily cold. In Seneca Hercules Oct. 729, "nives ut Eurus solvit aut tepidus Notus," Eurus melts snow, and the adjective tepidus plainly applies to both winds here mentioned. Eurus is described as melting snow in Odyssey xix. 206, ἦν τ' [sc. χιόνα] Εὐρος κατέτηξε, ἔπην Ζέφυρος καταχέυη. On the basis of this evidence, we are hardly justified either in inferring "cold" from "warm" or in considering tepidis appropriate to both Euris and notis. The temperature of Eurus apparently varies with the season: e.g., the passage of Seneca referred to the coming of spring (vere, Hercules Oct. 730). No particular season is indicated by Ovid. We shall be on safe ground if we regard tepidis as limited to notis.

³See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Auditi ist auch mit auf verba zu beziehen." It is possible that the equivalent of minantia is suggested in the first member also.

⁴See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Zu fronde saligna ist aus dem Folgenden nach der bei Ovid sehr beliebten Figur ἀπὸ κοινού superinposita zu ergänzen."

ject in Met. 1. 722 f.:

excipit hos volucrisque suae Saturnia pennis
conlocat

In Met. 111. 342-44:

caerula Liriope, quam quondam flumine curvo
implicuit clausaeque suis Cephisos in undis
vim tulit,

the common element which, as expressed, forms the direct object in the first member, is inferred as the indirect object in the second, where it is "represented" by the participle clausae. The distributed adjective and noun apply to a third member in Met. vi. 396 f.:

fertilis inmaduit madefactaque terra caducas
concepit lacrimas ac venis perbibit imis

(with anadiplosis in the second member).

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--The distribution of noun and attribute is the principal feature of the following instances: Met. x. 518, ". . . . aut huic adde levis aut illi deme pharetras"; Met. xv. 213, ". . . . aut spoliata suos aut, quos habet, alba capillos"; Ars 1. 771, "pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta laboris"; Ars 11. 36, "nec tellus nostrae nec patet unda fugae" (with AK of the verb); Amor. 1. 10. 19, "nec Venus apta feris, Veneris nec filius armis" (with AK of a predicate adjective, grammatically appropriate only to the first member: ellipsis of est). Almost complete balance between members of unusually large scope is a noteworthy feature of the passage Met. 11. 138 f.:

neu te dexterio^r tortum declinet ad Anguem,
neve sinisterio^r rota ducat ad Aram,

where the common direct object and subject (the latter "represented" by an adjective in the first member) are distributed, and the AK scheme is reinforced by antitheses between dexterio^r and sinisterio^r, declinet and ducat, ad Anguem and ad Aram.

(b) Anaphora.--The following instances show distribution of a noun and attribute: Met. iv. 117, ". . . . utque dedit no-
tae lacrimas, dedit oscula vesti"; Epist. xv. 291,¹ "Iuppi-

¹Venus aurea manifestly does not suggest Iuppiter aureus, since Jupiter is "golden" only in connection with the myth of Danaë: cf. Met. vi. 113, ". . . . aureus ut Danaen, Asopida luserit ignis"; Anthologia Palatina v. 217. 1 f.:

ter his gaudet, gaudet Venus aurea furtis" (with chiasmus); Met. vii. 444 f.:

terra negat sedem, sparsisque latronis
sedem negat ossibus unda
(genitive latronis also AK: with chiasmus); Met. i. 458, ". . . .
qui dare certa ferae, dare vulnera possumus hosti" (relative pro-
noun and principal verb also AK). In these examples we may note
that the scheme is reinforced by the antitheses of certain ele-
ments, e.g., of lacrimas and oscula (Met. iv. 117), and that in
one instance the contrasted elements are opposites: terra and
unda (Met. vii. 445). Distribution similar to that of the fore-
going instances, but in a more intricate scheme, appears in Amor.
i. 14. 9 f.:

nec tamen ater erat nec erat tamen aureus ille,
sed, quamvis neuter, mixtus uterque color;
here color, as inferred with ille, forms the subject in vs. 9, as
expressed, is the predicate in vs. 10: ille color is also the
logical subject in vs. 10. We may translate as follows: "Still,
that color was not black, still, it was not gold, but although
neither color, it was both colors blended." The verb erat, re-
peated in the second member, is AK as regards the following con-
text: thus two opposite devices, repetition of an element and AK,
are employed in the same sentence.

In other instances, the AK figure consists principally in
the distribution of a noun (or pronoun) and noun (or pronoun),
noun (or pronoun) and predicate adjective, or of two adjectives,
e.g., Epist. xi. 70, "dat populus sacris, dat pater ipse viam";
Epist. xiv. 106, "tu tibi dux comiti, tu comes ipsa duci"; Amor.
ii. 5. 31, "haec tibi sunt mecum, mihi sunt communia tecum." In
an instance which involves structure similar to anaphora, Epist.
Sapph. 21, "est in te facies, sunt apti lusibus anni," the pred-
icate adjective apti is, grammatically speaking, appropriate only
to the member in which it stands. Grammatical discrepancy also
marks an instance which involves partial anaphora: Met. vi. 525 f.:

. . . . frustra clamato saepe parente,
saepe sorore sua, magnis super omnia divis;

χρύσεος ἀψαύστοιο διέτμαγεν ἄμμα κορείας
Ζεύς, διαδὺς Δανάης χαλκελάτους θαλάμους;
cf. Anthologia Palatina v. 31. 5 f.:

δοκέω δ' ὅτι καὶ Δαναή Ζεύς
οὐ χρυσοῦς, χρυσοῦς δ' ἦλθε φέρων ἑκατόν.

the participle and adverb apply to three members. The passage Met. xv. 78 f.:

sunt herbae dulces, sunt quae mitescere flamma
mollirique queant

shows distribution of a noun (subject) and an adjectival clause which suggests an (essentially) opposite notion in the first member, i.e., "raw," "uncooked," or the like, is readily inferred from the expression quae mitescere flamma mollirique queant.¹ This expression also involves the distributive scheme (flamma in the first member, queant in the second).

(3) Asyndeton

Distribution of noun and adjective is seen in Epist. xx. 187 f.:

quid aufert
saeva mihi vitam, spem tibi diva mei.

The distributed common elements consist of a noun and an adverb in Amor. ii. 9. 9 f.:

venator sequitur fugientia, capta relinquit
semper et inventis ulteriora petit;

these elements apply to a third member, and the structure is only partially asyndetic. Contrast of two attributes accompanies asyndeton in Met. iv. 108-10:

. . . . 'una duos' inquit 'nox perdet amantes,
e quibus illa fuit longa dignissima vita,
nostra nocens anima est,'

but the logical ground for the antithesis is clear only if from the phrase longa dignissima vita we infer some such notion as "worthy of short life," and if from nocens we infer "innocent." The true antithesis is, then, as follows: ". . . . of whom, she was innocent and most worthy of a long life, my soul was guilty and worthy of a short life."² Knapp's interpretation, according to which innocens is to be inferred from nocens, only partially restores the antithesis.³

¹See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Entgegengesetzt werden roh essbare Früchte den durch Kochen genießbar zu machen."

²Cf. Propertius ii. 25. 45, ". . . . illaque plebeio vel sit bombycis amictu": see Introduction, p. 13.

³Charles Knapp, The Aeneid of Vergil and the Metamorphoses of Ovid (revised ed.; Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1928), p. 571: "Verse 109 = e quibus illa fuit innocens atque fuit longa dignissima vita."

B. Unbalanced Structure¹

A noun and its attribute or attributes are distributed between a principal and a relative clause in the following instances: Epist. iii. 147 f.:

me petat ille tuus, qui, si dea passa fuisset,
ensis in Atridae pectus iturus erat;

Epist. xx. 237 f.:

. . . . nisi quod nova forte repertast
quae capiat magnos littera lecta deos.

Climactic order, i.e., the postponement of an important word, on which the point of a narrative or of a statement depends, is achieved by a similar device in Met. x. 298 f.:

editus hac ille est, qui, si sine prole fuisset,
inter felices Cinyras potuisset haberi,

and in Met. iv. 325 f.:

sed longe cunctis longeque beatior illa
siqua tibi sponsa est, siquam dignabere taeda.

But here there is no clear logical unity of noun and pronoun; we may well interpret as follows: "There was born he who, had he been without issue, might have been considered among the blessed --I mean Cinyras," "But far, far happier she, if you have any betrothed, if you will deem any woman worthy of the bridal torch."

The relative clause precedes the principal clause in Epist. xii. 115, "quod facere ausa meast, non audet scribere dextra." A similar instance might be included under balanced structure: Epist. xii. 26, "quam pater est illi, tam mihi dives erat" (correlatives: logical co-ordination and grammatical subordination²).

Schemes of greater rarity appear in Met. viii. 871 f.:

¹The instances which are known to me involve only disparate clauses. The passage Ars i. 542-44:

ecce leves Satyri, praevia turba dei,
ebrius ecce senex: pando Silenus asello
vix sedet

might be thought to show distribution of the phrase ebrius senex Silenus (cf. Fasti i. 399, "venerat et senior pando Silenus asello") over parts of context remote from each other, but here the name Silenus is logically appositional to, rather than modified by, senex, and it is doubtful whether the phrase which I have suggested is a real logical unity, as is, e.g., postera Aurora in Vergil Aen. iv. 6 f.

²Cf. p. 62, n. 5.

ast ubi habere suam transformia corpora sensit,
saepe pater dominis Triopeida tradit

(distribution between temporal and principal clause: suspended subject), and in Amor. iii. 6. 73 f.:

o utinam mea lecta forent patrioque sepulcro
condita, cum poterant virginis ossa legi

(distribution between principal and temporal clause). In the latter instance, not only are the attribute mea and the noun ossa, logically a single unit, distributed between disparate clauses, but also ossa has a modifier in the temporal clause, namely the genitive virginis, which is almost of predicative force, i.e., the second member means: ". . . when my bones could have been gathered up, a maid's." It might almost be said that virginis in the temporal clause suggests an opposite notion in the principal clause, for this genitive reveals the grounds of the wish in the first member, namely, the fact that the speaker (Ilia) can no longer call her body that of a maid. We should now observe that forms of the verb legere (a repeated element) accompany the distributed elements and reinforce the whole scheme: the words mea lecta forent of the first member find a response in virginis ossa legi in the second. Full appreciation of the value of this couplet depends on an interpretation which takes the foregoing points into consideration. The meaning is somewhat as follows: "O would that the bones of poor me [now not a maid's] had been gathered up and laid away in the tomb of my ancestors, when they could have been gathered up, a maid's."

The passage Epist. vi. 159 f.:

quam fratri germana fuit miseroque parenti
filia, tam natis, tam sit acerba viro

(which might be regarded as involving balanced structure¹) presents a scheme of unusual complexity. Each of the two clauses shows AK of various types. As regards the subordinate clause, the verb fuit is AK in the first member; the adjective miser manifestly applies to both nouns. As regards the principal clause, the verb sit and the adjective acerba are AK in the second member. Acerba is inferred in the subordinate clause also, i.e., is AK in the second member as regards the larger units of the sentence. But the thought is curiously incomplete if we take the sentence merely at its face value, and interpret in the following manner:

¹Cf. Epist. xii. 26, cited on 89.

"As cruel as she was to her brother (as sister), as cruel as she was to her father (as daughter), so cruel to her children, so cruel to her husband may she be." For completeness of thought, the second member should be understood to mean "So cruel to her children as mother, so cruel to her husband as wife, may she be." The elements germana and filia, expressed in the first member, suggest related notions in the second member; acerba, expressed in the second member, is inferred in the first; hence the essential structure of the passage is distributive.

Two noteworthy instances show distribution, between a principal and a relative clause, of a demonstrative pronoun in one case and a noun or pronoun (which the demonstrative logically modifies) in another case: Epist. xvi. 243 f.:

sic illas vereor, quae, si tua gloria verast,
iudice te causam non tenuere duae;

Amor. ii. 2. 3 f.:

hesterna vidi spatiantem luce puellam,
illa quae Danaï porticus agmen habet.¹

II. Verb and Substantive or Adverb

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

The following are representative examples of bimembral structure in which a verb is AK in one member and a substantive or adverb is AK in the other: Epist. viii. 45, "Tantalides omnis ipsumque regebat Achillem" (subject AK in the first member); Met. x. 254 f.:

¹Cf. Fasti vi. 395 f.:

forte revertebar festis Vestalibus illa
quae Nova Romano munc via iuncta Foro est,
qua codd., quae Madvig (Adversaria Critica, II, 108). Madvig showed similar distribution elsewhere, e. g., Horace Epodes ii. 37 f.:

quis non malarum, quas amor curas habet,
haec inter obliviscitur?

Livy xxi. 29. 6, "cum eo, qui primus se obtulisset Romanus exercitus." Cf. also Juvenal iii. 90 f.:

miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec
ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito;

Lucretius vi. 313, ". . . ex illa quae tum res excipit ictum," among other citations in Munro on Lucretius i. 15.

corpus an illud ebur an sit
(subject AK in the second member); Met. ii. 482, ". . . . neve
preces animos et verba precantia flectant" (direct object
AK in the first member); Met. i. 603 f.:

. . . . non fluminis illas
esse nec umentis sensit tellure remitti
(subject of infinitive AK in the first member); Epist. xvi. 223,
"purpure nemp mihi pretiosaque texta dabuntur" (indirect
object AK in the first member); Met. xi. 87 f.:

Pactolonque petit, quamvis non aureus illo
tempore nec caris erat invidiosus harenis
(adverbial expression AK in the first member); Met. viii. 635,
"nec refert dominos illic famulosne requiras" (adverb AK in the
first member); Amor. ii. 6. 106, "sint rapidi soles siccaeque sem-
per hiemps" (adverb AK in the second member). Distribution of
more than two elements is seen in the following instances: Epist.
xix. 25, "non ego natura nec sum tam callidus usu"; Met. xiv. 628,
"nec iaculo gravis est, sed adunco dextera falce"; Met.
xv. 424 f.:

nunc humiles veteres tantummodo Troia ruinas
et pro divitiis tumulos ostendit avorum;
Ars i. 247, "luce deas caeloque Paris spectavit aperto";
Amor. i. 2. 17 f.:

acrius invitos multoque ferocius urget
quam qui servitium ferre fatentur Amor;
Met. ii. 193 f.:

sparsa quoque in vario passim miracula caelo
vastarumque videt trepidus simulacra ferarum;
Epist. i. 4, "vix Priamus tanti totaque Troia fuit"; Met. x. 659 f.:

dubium, Megareius heros
gaudeat an virgo magis his Schoeneia dictis;
Amor. ii. 1. 15, "in manibus nimbos et cum Iove fulmen habebam";
Met. ii. 47 f.:

. . . . currus rogat ille paternos
inque diem alipedum ius et moderamen equorum.
The noun which is AK is "represented" in the member in which it
is not expressed by an adjective in, e.g., Ars i. 172, ". . . .
Persidas induxit Cecropiasque rates"; Ars i. 55, "tot tibi tamque
dabit formosas Roma puellas" (subject also AK); Met. ii. 257 f.:

fors eadem Ismarios Hebrum cum Strymone siccet
Hesperiosque amnes Rhenum Rhodanumque Padumque
(subject also AK). In Met. v. 590 f.:

cana salicta dabant nutritaque populus unda
sponte sua natas ripis declivibus umbras,

the attributes cana and nutrita unda are AK, in addition to other elements, since either attribute is appropriate to either noun.¹

The distributed common elements apply not only to the members in which they are expressed, but to other members as well in the following representative examples: Met. iii. 349 f.:

. . . . exitus illam
resque probat letique genus novitasque furoris;

Met. iii. 594-96:

. . . . et Oleniae sidus pluviale capellae
Taygetenque Hyadenque oculis Arctonque notavi
ventorumque domos et portus puppibus aptos;

Met. iv. 693 f.:

nec secum auxilium, sed dignos tempore fletus
plangoremque ferunt.

The structure is more difficult (at least from our modern point of view) in Met. vii. 79-81:

utque solet ventis alimenta adsumere, quaeque
parva sub inducta latuit scintilla favilla
crescere et in veteres agitata resurgere vires;

the distributed common elements consist, essentially, of a verb and its subject. The members are constituted by infinitives dependent on the principal verb. The subject of this verb is not simply the so-called incorporated antecedent (scintilla), but the entire relative clause, so curiously (from our point of view) "inserted" before the second infinitive. Both the leading verb and its subject, naturally, apply to the third infinitive, in connection with which neither is expressed. Although it is well nigh impossible to retain the distributive scheme of the Latin in an English version, at least the effect of the entire relative clause as subject may be reproduced in some degree, if we translate as follows: ". . . . and just as what little spark has lain hidden under the overlying ashes is wont to gather sustenance from the winds, and to grow, and to rise again, when stirred, to its former vigor"

The common elements are distributed over three members in

¹Cf. Met. x. 96, ". . . . amnicolaeque simul salices"; Met. xi. 363, "iuncta palus huic est densis obsessa salictis"; Epist. ix. 64, "aptior Herculeae populus alba comae."

Met. ii. 689 f.:

divitis hic saltus herbosaque pascua Nelei
nobiliūmq̄ greges custos servabat equarū.

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--The following are relatively simple instances in bimembral structure: Met. iv. 308, "nec iaculum sumit nec pictas illa pharetras . . ."; Met. xiii. 10 f.:

sed nec mihi dicere promptum,
nec facere est isti;

Epist. xiii. 101, "cum venies, remoque move veloque carinam"; Met. ii. 414, ". . . . et modo leve manu iaculum, modo sumpserat arcum"; Epist. xi. 120, ". . . . nec mater fue-ro dicta nec orba diu"; Met. xv. 345, ". . . . has finire potest, illas aperire cavernas" (non-identical correlatives: noun AK "represented" by demonstrative in the first member). The passage Epist. Sapph. 107 f., 110:

per tibi, qui nunquam longe discedit, Amorem
perque novem iuro, numina nostra, deas
. . . .
nec me flere diu nec potuisse loqui

shows distribution of (a) pronoun and principal verb in the principal clause (where the members are joined by the copulative), and (b) subject of the infinitive, adverb, and complementary infinitive in the subordinate clause.

The distributed common elements apply to a third member in the following instances: Amor. i. 10. 7 f.:

aquilamque in te taurumque timebam
et quidquid magno de Iove fecit amor;

Met. vi. 350 f.:

nec solem proprium natura nec aëra fecit
nec tenuēs undas

(predicate adjective appropriate in accordance only to the first two members). In regard to Ars ii. 533 f.:

nec maledicta puta nec verbera ferre puellae
turpe nec ad tēneros oscula ferre pedes,

it might be thought that repetition of an element is substituted (partially) for the AK scheme in the final member, inasmuch as ferre is inferred in the first member from the second, but appears again in the third member. But it should be noted that ferre does not have the same meaning in the third member as it has in the second. We should have had not only AK, but also zeugma of

some difficulty, if in this sentence ferre were expressed but once. The Latin would then have somewhat the following effect: "Do not think it disgraceful either to bear [endure] a girl's curses or her blows or [to bring] kisses to her tender feet." Thus ferre in the final member does not represent simply the repetition of an element by way of rhetorical variation on, or reinforcement of, AK. Ovid is playing with the word ferre and telling his masculine readers that, in the pursuit of woman, man must not shrink from two kinds of "bearing." Hence it is quite necessary that the word ferre be repeated.

In Epist. xiii. 45 f.:

aut te Taenariae faciem culpasse maritae
aut illi vellem displicuisse tuam,

the principal verb is AK in the second member; the subject of the infinitive displicuisse is inferred from the direct object of the infinitive culpasse, and is "represented" in the second member by the adjective tuam. Similar "representation," but in a more complicated scheme, is to be found in Amor. iii. 3. 13 f.:

perque suos illam nuper iurasse recorder,
perque meos oculos; et dolueré me!

Here the noun which is AK is "represented" both in the preceding and in the following member by a possessive adjective, and is inferred in a different case in the final member. This member forms, essentially, a new sentence, hence the common element is inferred from remote context.¹

(b) Anaphora.--A relatively simple form of the scheme is exemplified in the following instances: Epist. xiii. 104, "tu mihi luce dolor, tu mihi nocte venis"; Amor. i. 14. 15, "non acus abrupit, non vallum pectinis illos"; Amor. i. 10. 27, "non equa munus equum, non taurum vacca poposcit"; Epist. Sapph. 68, "hoc mihi libertas, hoc pia lingua dedit"; Amor. i. 4. 20, "verba leges digitis, verba notata mero"; Met. x. 300, "procul hinc natae, procul este, parentes"; Epist. xiv. 92, ". . . territa quest forma, territa voce sua"; Epist. xi. 114, "haec tibi prima dies, haec tibi summa fuit"; Epist. i. 73, "quaecumque aequor habet, quaecumque pericula tellus . . ."; Ars i. 173 f.:

¹Since two elements are not distributed over parts of the context which are remote from each other, the final member does not involve the distributive scheme, and this example is not included under "unbalanced structure."

nempe ab utroque mari iuvenes, ab utroque puellae
venere

(adjective or pronoun "represents" the noun which is AK). In similar instances, the scheme closely resembles anaphora, e.g., Met. iii. 353, "multi illum iuvenes, multae cupiere puellae"; Amor. ii. 19. 17, "quas mihi blanditias, quam dulcia verba parabat"; Met. iv. 488 f.:

monstris exterrita coniunx,
territus est Athamas;

Met. viii. 383 f.:

primus vidisse putatur
et primus sociis visum ostendisse crucorem

(with anadiplosis).

Other instances show AK of more than two elements, e.g.,

Met. iii. 305 f.:

est aliud levius fulmen, cui dextra Cyclopum
saevitiae flammaeque minus, minus addidit irae

(with chiasmus); Amor. ii. 11. 11, "non illic urbes, non tu mira-
bere silvas"; Met. ix. 547, "tu servare potes, tu perdere solus
amantem"; Epist. x. 60, "non hominum video, non ego facta boum";
Met. i. 660, "de grege nunc tibi vir et de grege natus habendus";
Met. v. 496 f.:

hos nunc Arethusa penates,
hanc habeo sedem.

Among such examples we may include instances which involve AK of entire clauses: Met. xii. 120, ". . . . atque ait 'haec manus
est, haec, qua modo vicinus, hasta'"; Met. xiii. 664-66:

. . . . et timido possis ignoscere fratri:
non hic Aeneas, non, qui defenderet Andron,
Hector, erat;

Epist. xvi. 231 f.:

non erat Aeetes, ad quem despecta rediret,
non Idyia parens Chalciopeque socr.¹

The common elements are distributed over the first two members, and apply to subsequent members in Met. vii. 224-26:

et, quas Ossa tulit, quas altus Pelion herbas,
Orthrysque et Pindus, quas Pindo maior Olympus,
perspicit ,

¹planudes apparently did not consider parens common to Aeetes and Idyia: he paraphrases as follows: οὐδ' ἢν Αἰήτης ἐκεῖ, πρὸς δὲ ἂν ὑποστρέψειε περιφρονηθεῖσα, οὐχ ἢ μήτηρ αὐτῇ οὐδ' ἢ ἀδελφῇ Χαλκίοπῃ. It is doubtful also whether he regarded the relative clause as applying to any of the three persons mentioned except Aeetes.

and in Epist. xvi. 211 f.:

quid Priamus de me, Priami quid sentiet uxor,
totque tui Fratres Dardanidesque nurus

(with only partial anaphora in each instance). The common elements are distributed in other patterns: between the two final members, Met. vi. 428 f.:

non pronuba Iuno,
non Hymenaeus adest, non illi Gratia lecto;

Epist. xiii. 25 f.:

vix socer Iphiclus, vix me grandaeus Acestes,
vix mater gelida maesta refecit aqua;

between the first and third members, Met. vii. 261, ". . . terque senem flamma, ter aqua, ter sulphure lustrat." Common elements are distributed between the second and fourth members of a scheme involving four members in Met. i. 98 f.:

non tuba directi, non aeris cornua flexi,
non galeae, non ensis erant,

but the noun aeris manifestly applies only to the first two members. Similarly, in Met. i. 324-26:

Iuppiter ut liquidis stagnare paludibus orbem
et superesse virum de tot modo milibus unum
et superesse videt de tot modo milibus unam,

only the verb videt applies to the first of the three members. The interesting feature here is the nearly perfect balance, with repetition of several elements, between vss. 325 and 326, which is an indication that virum suggests an opposite notion in the final member, i.e., that "man" suggests "woman." The adjective unam "represents" the implied noun.

(3) Asyndeton

Some examples might be cited as showing either asyndeton or repeated elements, e.g., Met. v. 599 f.:

'quo properas, Arethusa?' suis Alpheus ab undis,
'quo properas?' iterum rauco mihi dixerat ore;

the passage Met. ii. 11-13:

. . . . quarum pars nare videtur,
pars in mole sedens viridis siccare capillos,
pisce vehi quaedam

is of particular interest, since an element which is repeated in the second member is inferred in the third, where it is "represented" by a pronoun: the repetition of an element is thus replaced by the opposite device, namely AK. The passage Met. vi. 17 f.:

nec factas solum vestes, spectare iuvabat
tum quoque, cum fierent . . .

might be included under correlatives, but the transition between the members is extremely abrupt. Repeated elements, i.e., forms of the verb facere, also play a part in this example. There is antithesis between the idea of completed action, expressed in the first member by the participle factas, and the idea of continued action, expressed in the second member by the clause cum fierent.

Asyndeton is accompanied by antithesis in the following representative examples also: with AK of two elements only, Ars 11. 71, "monte minor collis, campis erat altior aequis"; Met. xiii. 353, "tibi turba comes, mihi contigit unus"; Epist. xv. 81, "regna Iovis coniunx, virtutem filia iactat"; Met. xiii. 730 f.:

Scylla latus dextrum, laevum inrequieta Charybdis
infestat

(an adjective "represents" the common noun in the second member); with AK of several elements, Epist. xv. 47 f.:

territa consurgit metuendaque noctis opacae
visa seni Priamo, vatibus ille refert.

The first member is negated in Ars 11. 55 f.:

sed tibi non virgo Tegarae comesque Bootae,
ensiger Orion adspiciendus erit.

Grammatical discrepancies mark the following instances, which also show antithesis: Met. xiv. 651, "miles erat gladio, piscator harundine sumpta" (participle inferred in a different gender); Amor. 1. 2. 48, "tu gravis alitibus, tigribus ille fuit" (verb inferred in a different person); Ars 11. 53, "aëra non potuit Minos, alia omnia clausit" (verb inferred in a different mood). The passage Met. 1. 463-65:

filii huic Veneris 'figat tuus omnia, Phoebe,
te meus arcus'; ait 'quantoque animalia cedunt
cuncta deo, tanto minor est tua gloria nostra'

is of considerable intricacy. The verb figat is to be inferred in a different mood in the member in which it is not expressed;¹ arcus is "represented" by an adjective (tuus) in the member in which it is inferred. Furthermore, parallelism in meaning between omnia and cuncta shows clearly that animalia is to be inferred from remote context with omnia. Thus omnia means not "all things" but "all animate things," not only the animals which Apollo

¹See Korn-Ehwald ad loc.: "Aus dem konzessiven figat ist figet oder figit hineinzudenken."

shoots as hunter, but the human beings whom he destroys in his anger. In the final verse of the above passage, gloria is AK, i.e., is inferred with nostra (in a disparate phrase). In Met. viii. 414 f.:

. . . . missisque duabus
hasta prior terra, medio stetit altera tergo,
not only are subject noun and verb distributed, but the noun hasta is also inferred in the ablative plural in a preceding phrase (disparate), the meaning of which is, of course, missis duabus hastis.

The asyndetic structure conveys no sharp antithesis in Met. xii. 133, ". . . ter quater ora viri, capulo cava tempora pulsat", but is well suited to the animated style in which the battle between Achilles and Cygnus is recounted.

B. Unbalanced Structure¹

The following instances might be regarded as showing either disparate clauses or clauses introduced by correlatives:²
Met. xii. 200 f.:

. . . . quam vino pectus tam virgine visa
ardet;

Epist. xiv. 117, "nam mihi quot fratres, totidem periere sorores";

Epist. xii. 144, "quo propior vox haec, hoc mihi peius erat";

Epist. x. 23, ". . . et quotiens ego te, totiens locus ipse vocabat" (with grammatical discrepancy). The predicate adjective is expressed in the principal clause, the verb and subject in the clause of comparison, in Epist. xvi. 253, "apta magis Veneri quam sunt tua corpora Marti."

Two instances which, if we follow Khwald's text, are of great difficulty, may be cited here, although it must be admitted that the text may be unsound. The first of these is to be found in vss. 749 f. of the passage Met. viii. 743-50. Vss. 743 and 746 read as follows:

stabat in his ingens annoso robore quercus
.
saepe sub hac dryades festas duxere choreas.

¹No examples of distribution in remote context are known to me.

²Logical co-ordination and grammatical subordination.
Cf. p. 62, n. 5.

Ehwald's text provides the following reading for vss. 749 f.:

. . . . nec non et cetera tantum
silva sub hac omnis, quantum fuit herba sub omni.¹

Here the verb is inferred in the principal clause from the relative clause, the noun silva in the relative clause, but in a different case from that in which it is expressed. The phrase sub omni repeats the element omnis which is expressed in the first member as a modifier of silva expressed: if the adjective is repeated, it may reasonably be felt to modify the same noun in thought. Hence, if this text is correct, we understand, not sub omni arbore, or the like, but sub omni silva. On the other hand, sub hac in the first member refers to an element in preceding context, and does not enter into the scheme. Naturally it would be much easier to read with Heinsius: ". . . . silva sub hac, silva quanto iacet herba sub omni." The second instance occurs in vs. 169 of the passage Met. xiv. 167-70:

'iterum Polyphemon et illos
 adspiciam fluidos humano sanguine rictus,
 hac mihi si potior domus est Ithacique carina,
 si minus Aenean veneror genitore

where there is, first of all (at least in this text), obvious distribution of verb (est) and subject (carina). If the reading of MSG, here reproduced,² and followed by Jahn, Magnus, and Ehwald,

¹silva sub hac consensus codd. optimorum, silva sub hac, silva vulgate, Heinsius; sub omni MN, sub illa hg vulgate, herba sub arbore I, quanto iacet herba sub omni vulgate, Heinsius. Korn-Ehwald paraphrase: "Alle übrigen Bäume standen so tief unter diesem, als unter ihnen das Gras." With the difficult locution cetera silva omnis, cf. Apuleius Met. ii. 9, "tanta denique est capillamenti dignitas, ut quamvis auro veste gemmis omnique cetero mundo exornata mulier incedat, tamen, nisi capillum distinxerit, ornata non possit audire," where omni cetero mundo clearly means "every other adornment." It is probable that cetera silva omnis means, not "all the rest of the wood," but "every other tree." Lewis and Short, s.v. silva, refer to instances in which the poets use the plural in the meaning "trees," e.g., Propertius i. 14. 5, ". . . . et nemos unde satas intendat vertice silvas"; Vergil Geo. ii. 26 f.:

silvarumque aliae pressos propaginis arcus
 expectant

Elsewhere in Ovid the singular silva approaches the meaning "tree": Met. vii. 676, ". . . . qua tamen e silva teneas hostile recisum" (i.e., "from what kind of tree"); Ars iii. 573 f.:

ignibus heu! lentis uretur, ut umida faena,
 ut modo montanis silva recisa iugis

(i.e., "like a log just cut from the mountain ridges").

²haec mihi ni potior domus est Ithacique carina Fu vulgate, εἰ μὴ βελτίων ἦδε μοι διατριβὴ καὶ τῆς ὀδυσεῶς νεώς Flamides, haec michi ne patiar domus est Ithacique carina M, ni N, si N¹.

is correct,¹ carina (ablative) is to be inferred with hac from the nominative carina at the end of the verse, i.e., a word is to be inferred in a different case (grammatically speaking) with an element which is not in parallel structure. As it stands, the passage means: "May I again behold Polyphemus and those jaws dripping with human blood, if home and the ship of the Ithacan are preferable in my eyes to this ship, if I revere Aeneas less than my father." The speaker is Achaemenides, who has just been taken aboard Aeneas' ship.

III. Principal Verb and Infinitive or Subjunctive:
Participle and Sum Auxiliary

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative or disjunctive

Two elements only are distributed in the following representative examples: Met. iv. 256 f.:

. . . . quamvis amor excusare dolorem
iudiciumque dolor poterat

(with repetition of an element); Met. xv. 461, ". . . . tuta esse
et honesta sinamus"; Met. viii. 185 f.:

'terras licet' inquit 'et undas
obstruat

(parataxis); Met. vii. 686, ". . . . cur sit et unde datum";
Met. v. 186, ". . . . nec citra mota nec ultra est"; more than
two in the following: Met. v. 375 f.:

pallada nonne vides iaculatricemque Dianam
abscessisse mihi?

Met. x. 46 f.:

¹See Magnus ad loc. for a discussion of emendations and interpretations, particularly the note of Ellis in Simmons' edition: Charles Simmons, P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon xiii, xiv (London: Macmillan and Co., 1907), p. 189. Ellis defended the reading haec ni by interpreting as follows: "If this is not in my eyes a preferable home (to my own) and a better ship of Ulysses (than the real one in which I once voyaged)". Magnus thought this interpretation intolerably strained. Difficulties may be avoided by reading hac mihi si potior domus est Ithaceque carina (with Bersman and Navagero, see Magnus ad loc.): "If home and Ithaca are preferable in my eyes to this ship." The thought of vs. 170, that "Aeneas is a second father" would then be clearly balanced by the thought that "their ship is a second home."

. . . . nec regia coniunx
sustinet oranti nec, qui regit ima, negare;

Met. vi. 390 f.:

sallientia viscera possis
et perlucentes numerare in pectore fibras;

Met. xi. 370 f.:

neque enim leiunia curat
caede boum diramque famem finire . . . ;

Met. viii. 554 f.:

. . . . nec fortibus illic
profuit armentis nec equis velocibus esse.

In a similar instance, Met. viii. 93 f.:

. . . . nec me nunc tradere crinem
sed patrium tibi crede caput,

it is probable that the attributive adjective patrium is inferred with crinem in the first member, since it is equally appropriate to that noun: Scylla is speaking to Minos in these verses. The passage Epist. xviii. 29 f.:

utque rogem de te et scribam tibi, siquis Abydo
venerit aut, quaero, siquis Abydon eat

contains a highly unusual arrangement. A volitive clause and the principal verb are here distributed, with this peculiarity, that the first part of the volitive clause (ut rogem de te) is logically related to the first indirect question (siquis Abydo venerit), and the second part (ut . . . scribam tibi) is logically related to the second indirect question (siquis Abydon eat). Palmer termed the structure "a double trajectory."¹

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--Two common elements only are distributed in, e.g., Epist. xix. 161, "hic metuit mendax, haec et per-iura vocari" (non-identical correlatives); Met. ix. 200 f.:

. . . . cui nec virtute resisti
nec telis armisque potest;

more than two in, e.g., Ars i. 323, ". . . et modo se Europen fieri, modo postulat Ion"; Epist. xx. 65 f.:

vel numquam malle^m vel non mihi tempore in illo
esset in Aegaeis cognita Delos aquis.

Studied and nearly perfect balance in members of unusually large scope marks the passage Met. xi. 534-36:

¹Palmer, Heroides, p. 470.

trepidant haud segnius omnes,
quam solet urbs aliis murum fodientibus extra,
atque aliis murum trepidare tenentibus intra.

The distributed common elements apply to members other than those in which they are expressed in Met. ix. 598 f.:

nonne vel illa dies fuerat vel tota voluntas,
sed potius mutanda dies?

(correlatives in the first two members), and in Met. xv. 871 f.:

iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis
nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.

(b) Anaphora.--The following are representative examples: with distribution of two common elements, Amor. iii. ll. 41, "aut formosa fores minus, aut minus inproba, vellem" (with correlatives); Epist. ii. 26, "verba queror reditu, verba carere fide"; Epist. xii. 106, ". . . nunc tibi sum pauper, nunc tibi visa nocens"; Met. viii. 735, "saepe lapis poteras, arbor quoque saepe videri"; with distribution of more than two common elements, Met. viii. 832 f.:

. . . . quodque urbibus esse,
quodque satis poterat populo, non sufficit uni.

The passage Met. xii. 622-24:

non ea Tydides, non audet Oileos Ajax,
non minor Atrides, non bello maior et aevo
poscere, non alii

is more complicated. Here the three elements which constitute the logical unit ea audet poscere are distributed over three members and are inferred in a final member, with slight grammatical discrepancy. In vs. 623, Atrides is AK in the first of two members, and is "represented" by the adjective maior in the second: this adjective is itself AK in the first of two members (as regards the two ablatives of respect).

(3) Asyndeton

A relatively simple instance, with characteristic antithesis, is seen in Met. xiv. 109, ". . . dextera per ferrum est, pietas spectata per ignes."¹ The following instance is more complicated; Amor. ii. 5. 57 f.:

. . . . malumst, quod tota labellis
lingua tuast nostris, nostra recepta tuis;

¹per ferrum est Ne², Magnus, Ehwald; per ferrum ceteri
codd.

the elements labellis and lingua are "represented" in the second member by adjectives which were expressed in the first member also, but whereas, in the first member, tua modified lingua, and nostris modified labellis, in the second member tuis is the modifier of labellis inferred, nostra of lingua inferred. The adjective tota, which is expressed in the first member, is manifestly implied in the second as well.

B. Unbalanced Structure
(Disparate Clauses)

Two examples show distribution of principal verb and infinitive between a principal clause and a clause of comparison:

Epist. xvii. 107 f.:

non magis illius numerari gaudia noctis
Hellespontiaci quam maris alga potest;

Epist. xix. 11 f.:

invenies illic, id te spondere, quod opto
te potius, virgo, quam meminisse deam.

IV. Verb or Noun and Preposition, Conjunction,
or Relative Adverb

A. Balanced Structure

(1) With copulative

Where the members are joined by the copulative, little interest attaches to instances in which the preposition is AK in the first member, e.g., Epist. iii. 6, "fas est, de domino pauca viroque queror." This order is essentially that of a preposition preceding two nouns which it governs, save that another element intrudes. The occurrence of the common preposition in the second member is, however, far less usual, even when the members are joined by the copulative. Such an occurrence forms part of the distributive scheme in Ars i. 723 f.:

candidus in nauta turpis color: aequoris unda
debet et a radiis sideris esse niger

(subject inferred from remote context), and (probably) in Epist. vi. 107 f.:

illa sibi Tanai Scythiaeque paludibus udae

quaerat et a patria Phasidis usque virum.¹

(2) Repeated elements

(a) Correlatives.--The preposition is AK in the second member, other common elements are distributed, and the members are distinguished by non-identical correlatives, in the following instances: Met. x. 212 f.:

flos oritur formamque capit quam lilia, si non
purpureus color his, argenteus esset in illis

(noun "represented" by adjective in the second member); Ars 1. 763, "hic iaculo pisces, illic capiuntur ab hamis."

(b) Anaphora.--A preposition is AK in the first member in Met. v. 462, "quas dea per terras et quas erraverit undas"; in the second member in Met. vii. 708, "pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore," and in Epist. xv. 317 f.:

sola iaces viduo tam longa nocte cubili,
in viduo iaceo solus et ipse toro.

The conjunction is AK in the first member in Amor. iii. 9. 1, "Memnona si mater, mater ploravit Achillem," and in Met. iv. 649 f.:

'vade procul, ne longe gloria rerum,
quam mentiris' ait, 'longe tibi Iuppiter absit.'

(3) Asyndeton

Conjunction and verb are distributed in Met. vi. 113, ". . . aureus ut Danaen, Asopida luserit ignis" In Met. viii. 356, "emicat ex oculis, spirat quoque pectore flamma," the preposition is AK in the first member, in structure closely resembling asyndeton, if quoque is the correct reading. The vul-

¹Tanais PGEw, a Tanai codd. deteriores, Tanai Heinsius. See Palmer, Heroides, p. 335: "Tanai is to be preferred to a Tanai, for the supplying of a preposition from the second clause is quite Ovidian; for it Loers quotes Met. vii. 708 pectore Procris erat mihi Procris semper in ore, and Ib. 12. 124 Inde velut muro solidave a caute repulsa est, but it is more harsh to supply it here. To take Tanai for 'at the Don,' 'beside the Don,' would be legitimate in Propertius, scarcely so in Ovid." Cf. Vitus Loers, P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides (Cologne: Dumont-Schauberg, 1829-30), ad loc., and Korn-Ehwald on Met. xii. 124: "Die Verwendung der Präposition nach der Figur des ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ findet sich bei Ovid öfter vgl. 7, 708 pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore, ebenso z. B. A. a. 1, 723. 759. 763. Her. 6, 107. Derselbe Gebrauch findet sich bei Vergil, Horaz, Propertius, u. a."

gate text, and Jahn among modern editors, read spiratque e pectore flamma. There is, however, no good reason to reject a reading which has the support of all important MSS; inference of a preposition from preceding context is no more difficult here than in Epist. xvii. 39, "in me, si nescis, non aequora, saevis," or in Amor. i. 9. 18, "in rivale oculos alter, ut hoste, tenet." On the other hand, it is not necessary to regard pectore precisely as a separative ablative without a preposition, since the preposition is already expressed in the first member. The common preposition occurs in the second member in Amor. i. 1. 27, "sex mihi surgat opus numeris, in quinque residat" (with AK of a pronoun and noun also), and in Met. vi. 190, "'hospita tu terris erras, ego' dixit 'in undis'" (with AK of a verb, which is inferred in a different person). The distributed relative adverb and verb apply to a third member in Met. xi. 614 f.:

somnia vana iacent totidem, quot messis aristas,
silva gerit frondes, electas litus harenas.

B. Unbalanced Structure

The following instance, in which a preposition is AK, might be regarded as showing either unbalanced or balanced structure (i.e., correlatives): Ars i. 759, "pectoribus mores tot sunt quot in orbe figurae."

